

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Micah 6: 8: *He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord, thy God, require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?*

Eternal and ever-gracious God, we have entered upon this Lenten season, earnestly beseeching Thee that every thought of our mind may be brought into captivity to the mind of Christ.

Grant that in this time of self-denial and self-examination we may resolve to surrender ourselves more completely to Thy divine will and serve humanity more eagerly.

We penitently confess that we often are disobedient to what Thou dost require of us and that there is still so much selfishness in our hearts, for we live and labor as if our own success and security are the blessings and achievements of supreme worth and enduring value.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that glorious day of prediction when every knee shall bow before Thee and every tongue confess that the Christ is the Lord to the glory of God.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

THE GRIFFIN AMENDMENT TO THE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BILL WILL PREVENT MUCH REAL HELP TO EDUCATIONAL TV STATIONS AND SHOULD BE DEFEATED IN CONFERENCE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the educational television bill—H.R. 132—was adopted, we had an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. At the time the gentleman from Michigan said that his amendment would not eliminate from the provisions of the bill any organization which was presently operating an educational television station.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied the matter carefully since yesterday, and have checked its direct effect in my own community of Schenectady where we have

one of the real pioneers in educational television, the Mohawk Hudson Council on Educational Television. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, no agency may get any assistance from the Federal Government unless it is composed exclusively of bona fide educational institutions. This great council which has been a pioneer in educational television in upstate New York is composed of 125 agencies, most of them bona fide schools. But also included in this council are such civic organizations as the American Association of University Women, the local chapter of the American Cancer Institute, and the Capital District Association for Nose and Throat Health.

Thus under the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, the Mohawk Hudson Council would not qualify for help. I know a similar situation prevails in almost every other educational television council in New York State.

What a mockery, Mr. Speaker, to pass a bill designed to help educational television agencies and then exclude from its provisions those very agencies which are most genuinely interested in promoting it, and which have worked hardest for it. Therefore I urge the House and Senate conferees to strike from the bill this unfortunate amendment, which can do so much harm to New York State, especially at a time when the State administration itself is cutting back on its own support for educational television and when Federal help is thus even more essential.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1962.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Addonizio	[Roll No. 31]	Colmer
Andrews	Barry	Cooley
Avery	Bennett, Mich.	Dent
Bailey	Chief	Garland
	Coad	

Glenn	McIntire	Sheppard
Gray	Meader	Smith, Miss.
Harrison, Va.	Moeller	Steed
Hoffman, Mich.	Powell	Ullman
Holifield	Rains	Whitten
Hosmer	Rousselot	Wright
Kornegay	Selden	Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 8916.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASING THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND REDISTRICTING CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution—House Resolution 557—providing for the consideration of H.R. 10264, a bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10264) to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of four hundred and thirty-eight Members beginning with the Eighty-eighth Congress. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and at the

conclusion of my remarks I yield one-half hour to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate and amendment of the bill under the 5-minute rule. I know the Members are all aware of the nature of this legislation and what it means to many Members of Congress. As I stand here I know that I am personally affected as a Member from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, because under the new apportionment resulting from the 1960 census we were cut from 14 Members of Congress to 12. I am also aware, as I know you are, that we are affected because of the fact that we have one party in control of the legislature with a Governor of the opposite party. You may ask: Why do you not go back to your State and clean up your own problem? We are not asking on the basis of the fact that you have an opportunity to help some of your fellow Congressmen; you are always helping your constituents or asking Members of Congress to help you along with legislation. Now you have an opportunity to help a group of Members who are here and need your assistance.

We are asking for this bill purely on the history of such legislation in this Congress.

In the year 1840 there were 31 States in the Union and there were 232 Members of the House of Representatives, and the membership was increased in 1850 to 237. In the next decade new States came into the Union and the membership was increased in 1860 to 243.

In 1870 there were 38 States in the Union. The membership was increased to 293.

By 1880 the membership of Congress was increased to 332, due to the admittance of several States.

In 1890 the membership was increased to 357, due to the admittance of several more States having come into the Union.

In 1900 the number was increased to 391, here again was the admittance of new States.

In 1910 there were 48 States which had been admitted into the Union, the membership was increased to 435.

So for 120 years it has always been the custom of this Congress when new States were admitted to statehood to increase the membership of the House of Representatives.

There are those who say it is unwieldy. Let me ask, is it unwieldy to have more Members of Congress because for the past 2 years we have had seated in this House 437 Congressmen, including 1 from Hawaii and 1 from Alaska. Under the 1960 census Hawaii will be entitled to two Congressmen.

When this legislation was passed through the years, it was never the intent of the fathers who sat in the Congress in those days to deny the right of the seating Congressmen. They always made the recommendation and they always increased the number.

Referring to the Senate of the United States, that body automatically by the Constitution has increased its membership four Senators. There are Members

who say that they do not think the number should be increased beyond 438. For 60 of the 170 years of this august body there was an even number of Members in the Congress, and I never heard in that history of anything ever happening differently.

I believe that this is a good bill. The purpose of the bill is stated in the report, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to prevent the recent admission to the Union of the States of Alaska and Hawaii from having the effect of reducing the number of Representatives in Congress shared by the original 48 States below the number to which those States have been entitled over the past half century.

I have explained to you the situation as it exists in Massachusetts. Under this bill there are three States that would benefit. Massachusetts would lose one seat instead of two. Pennsylvania would gain one seat, Missouri would gain one seat.

I feel sorry for those two States that are just over the line that are losing seats.

When our late beloved and dear Speaker, Sam Rayburn, became sick, he had intended and he told the Members of Congress he was going to increase the membership by three or increase it by four, and he wanted the level to stop there.

I have spoken to Members and I have asked them on a personal basis to go along with this legislation. One fellow asked, "What does it do for my State?" Actually it does nothing for his State, and I feel sorry that it does nothing for his State, but in his State he would have to increase the number by 25 Members in order to help. Now, because nothing is going to be done for his State, is he going to disregard the pattern that the Congress has followed throughout all the years? Because he cannot get an increase himself, is he going to sacrifice the other Congressmen from these three States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule will be adopted, and trust the bill will pass.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation has been very ably explained. The rule that comes to us today is an open rule, which I think is extremely advisable, and provides 1 hour general debate.

Mr. Speaker, what has been said about the admission of Alaska and Hawaii is indisputable, it is absolutely true. When new States came into the Union it has been customary, at least it was customary for many years, to increase the size of the House of Representatives. However, it is my understanding that in 1912, when the last apportionments were made, it was considered necessary to make the statement that that was going to be the total for many years to come; that more than 435 Members would be unwieldy. Now, a great many people throughout the country—and I say this is not said in a spirit of merriment—believe it would be better to decrease the House of Representatives rather than to increase it. So, there are two schools of thought in this whole matter. Personally, I can see a great deal of justification in saying

that you should increase the size when you increase the number of States, but I would like to remind you before you go too far with this legislation that you are probably opening a Pandora's box that may well come back to plague us all. We are going to have a good many more States that I can foresee in the future. Puerto Rico is knocking at the door and will soon gain admission; I have no doubt of that. The Virgin Islands also will be admitted as a State. There are rumors that Guam is also likely to want statehood, and there may be others. For that reason the House will grow and grow if this formula is adopted.

Now, another thing I would like to point out—and, of course, this may be human nature that we deplore—why should certain States be singled out for those seats and others have to give up seats? Take my own State of New York; take 21 States on this list that are all losing. And, why are they losing? Because they did their homework, because their State legislatures met, and because they reapportioned according to population. Now, we are the ones that are left, so to speak, and these three States who did not quite do all their homework and who feel that they are aggrieved—and who, I must say, have justification, Mr. Speaker; I am not denying that—come in and get these added seats. I think we should look into this very, very carefully while we consider this legislation, while we look over the list of the affected States, and what it means to our own districts. I have every confidence that the decision of the House will be a wise one; I am not speaking against the bill in speaking on this bill. I am merely trying to point out some of the pitfalls that I can see ahead. It is so easy to give, especially to our friends—and we have many very dear friends in the House—that we do not want to see adversely affected. Nevertheless, this has deeper implications than personal friendship.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Would the gentlewoman have objected to this increase if it had been made at the time when the two new States were admitted to the Union?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will say to my colleague that I would not, because I think at that time we would all have had plenty of time to look ahead, and all the State legislatures would have taken measures accordingly. As it is now, some are left, more or less, in left field.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Is it not fair to say, then, that the gentlewoman bases her objection solely on the ground of lapse of time?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I base it on the way this bill is presented to us. I do not think it is a matter of lapse of time, but I think it is coming in here at the last minute, when all of these other States have taken the necessary measures and when we have had apportionment and when we are losing very valuable and dear Members. I think that is the unfortunate part.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. When the gentlewoman says that certain States have been singled out for preference, will she not admit that that is merely a matter of mathematics?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. No, I do not admit that it is a matter of mathematics. In some of these States the State legislatures have not taken the necessary measures.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I respectfully submit that has nothing to do with the case. Is it not a fact that the question is of three new Members, and that under the mathematics of the reapportionment provisions there happened to be three States that would be affected? It is a matter of mathematics.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think you would have to argue that out with a good many people who are losing Members who would object to that, but I personally am not one of those involved.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my question by saying I am very much seeking information. Is it my understanding that had this action been taken timely, had it been taken earlier, would it have still been these three same States that would be benefited?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes; I understand that they would have been benefited.

Mr. JOHANSEN. But at the same time they would have been benefited in a perfectly orderly way?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. If I may say so, an understandable way. I think now it has caused a great deal of hard feeling and I am very much afraid that we may see that when we come to the general debate on this bill. I think it is unfortunate. I do not think there should be any feelings on this subject. I think it should go through in an orderly manner.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. My colleague from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has taken pride in the fact that the State of New York has done its homework. I would like to advise the gentlewoman from New York that on the basis of what they deserve as a grade for doing their homework she deserves a State legislature dominated by a Republican Party—deserves a "U" for unsatisfactory service, and a job very poorly done. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction. If the other States did as poorly in their homework as the State of New York, I feel sorry for those States.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sorry, but I cannot quite agree with the gentleman. I can see his point of view, but my point of view is totally different. I am very proud of the Empire State of New York. I am sorry that my friend has to apologize for it.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, just so that the scales of justice may be kept in entire balance, I would like to point out that the State of California has a Democratic legislature, and if one ever saw a first-class job of gerrymandering, that legislature did it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] who was the father and author of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and was chairman of the subcommittee at that time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for giving me this time even though I have an uneasy feeling that at the moment some of my colleagues may look upon me as a man returning to the scene of the crime. It is true that I was one of the advocates of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and that the bill before you would increase the membership of the House by the number of seats to which the two new States are entitled under the 1960 Federal census.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this brief time to explain why the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not meet this problem when we drafted the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills. I might say, before giving that answer, that if we had done so at that time we would then, as now, have affected exactly the same three States which are affected now. It would have had nothing whatsoever to do with the ebb and flow of the population which caused so much difficulty in so many other States. But, Mr. Speaker, to return to the answer as to why we did not propose an increase in the membership—semipermanent increase—it was not our prerogative. It was the prerogative of the Judiciary Committee to consider the overall question of increasing or reducing the size of the House on a semipermanent basis. So, we acted within our jurisdiction, and did not go beyond it. We had a tactical reason to do so, if you will, because if we had been tempted to seize a jurisdiction which was not ours, we would have refrained from doing so because we would have raised an additional controversy over a bill which was already highly controversial.

Mr. Speaker, I have read that this bill was to be rammed through the House to take care of selfish interests of Members from the three States which would be directly affected. Now, I would be very naive if I said there is no personal interest here. I am happy that the bill may help friends of mine in both parties who reside in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. I also would be happy if the direct impact was on any other State or States in which my friends reside, and from which they are elected. But those who criticize this move are putting the cart before the horse. They are confusing the pleasant byproduct of helping some friends with the fact that they just happen to be the beneficiaries of carrying out a historical tradition.

We are not here attempting to swell the membership of the House to meet the ebb and flow of population among the States. What we are doing very simply is what has been done repeatedly and consistently since 1840, increasing the membership of the House because of the admission of new States.

Mr. Speaker, I would support this bill if the direct beneficiaries were New York, Arkansas, and Alabama; or Illinois, Montana, and California; or any combination you might mention. Why then should we turn our backs on tradition because Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Missouri are to reap the benefits?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the argument that this House would become unwieldy if we admitted one more voting Member than we have now and have had during the last 3 years falls of its own weight. I would not like to see an unwieldy House; but may I suggest that we might come to a point in this country where our system would become unwieldy and Members representing too large districts would begin to think as Senators properly think and no longer represent districts as we have considered them since the beginning of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very sincerely that this House will not turn its back on a tradition it has followed scrupulously for 120 years.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman had a great deal to do with the legislation that admitted the States of Hawaii and Alaska to the Union and he should be complimented, as he was at that time, for the tremendous fight that he made for the admission of those States. The gentleman will recall that at least a couple of times during the course of the consideration of the admission of those States—either at one time or both together, on one occasion—it was suggested, and I think an amendment was considered, to increase the membership of the House to take care of the States about to be admitted. The gentleman will recall that there was opposition to increasing the membership of the House, even to providing a Member each for those two States; is that not right?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. That is correct. There was opposition, I may say to the gentleman, if my recollection is clear, to practically everything we had in the bill from those who intended to vote against it, no matter what its ultimate form.

Mr. HARRIS. Even the leadership, those who were supporting the admission, generally speaking were opposed to any increase in the membership of the House, even with the admission of those States. The gentleman will recall, and I would like to remind the House that during one of the debates I took the floor of the House and called attention to the fact that somebody was going to lose. I explained the problem we had with the method of apportionment at that time, calling attention to the methods that were available and the ones that were used. I think the House had changed from the method

of apportionment to the present method that is being used. So it would seem to me that if the attitude at that time was for the purpose of opposing any increase, it comes very late just to increase the membership at this time on that basis. For that reason it seems to me the argument to increase the membership to take care of some 12 or more States would be the more proper course for this House to take at this time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I should hesitate, of course, to include myself, even by the furthest stretch of the imagination, under the word "leaders." But for a few difficult days back there during the statehood fight, I assumed I was one of the leaders in the fight to bring in the two new States. I have reexamined everything that was said on the Alaska statehood bill during the last few days, and at no time during that debate did I, as the floor manager of that bill, say that I was opposed to increasing the membership of the House.

The only reference was in response to a question from a gentleman who wanted information, and he asked what the bill would do in that respect. I stated what the bill would do in that respect. I felt then and I said so, to many of my colleagues, as I feel now, that the initiation for a semipermanent increase in the House should come from the Committee on the Judiciary and not from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself wholeheartedly with what I think is the unanswerable argument presented in favor of this bill by the gentleman from New York. The House of Representatives initiated legislation which brought the two additional States into the Union, and thereby made certain that there would be three additional Members from areas not previously represented in the House. It is only plain equity that we increase the size of the House to take care of those three additional Members without depriving the original 48 States of the number of Representatives they had. My State does not gain from this bill, and the gentleman's State does not gain from it. It is a matter of principle that is involved. It is not a question of any three States being made special beneficiaries. It is not to help any particular State that I vote for it. It is to prevent the entire Congress and the country as a whole being penalized, as they would be if this bill is not passed to take care of Members from the two additional States which we have welcomed into the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman. I might say that if the three States affected today were the States of Iowa, New York, and Alabama, then those States or the Representatives from those States would be accused of having selfish motives.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with the gentleman that it is not to help particular

States, but to do the right and fair thing for all.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from New York. I was his counterpart in the handling of the two statehood bills, and I think he will recall that even though Hawaii was entitled to two Representatives in the Congress at the time of its admission, so that our committee would not be accused of partisan politics, we insisted that Hawaii come in with only one Representative.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I might say to the gentleman that, in deferring the additional seat to which Hawaii was entitled, we left the matter of the acquisition of an extra seat open for further developments and further action.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. In view of the statement that was just made that Hawaii was entitled to two Members, but will have only one Member in the House until the next census and reapportionment occurs, it is assumed that they will continue to operate with just one Member instead of three, if we increase the size of the House to allow seats for the two new States, we would increase it by two seats rather than three; is that not a correct statement?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No, we will increase it by three Members. The bill that was passed granting statehood to Hawaii gave Hawaii only one seat even though we knew that Hawaii was entitled to two seats in the House of Representatives. But, the bill also provided that Hawaii should be entitled to their regular number after the next apportionment which was in 1960—and that number is two. So we still come back to the three seats.

Mr. Speaker, may I say just one final word. The old story of suggesting that this House as the result of the tradition of this situation may burgeon one day to the point where we have 500 or 600 or 700 Members—it is very easy to go around the Pacific and elsewhere and pick out pieces of land and say, "They will be here practically tomorrow asking for statehood." Well, I do not know how long the good Lord will permit me to live and I do not know how long my constituents will permit me to serve here in the House of Representatives, but I do not expect that in my time, and I do not expect in the time of the youngest Member in this House of Representatives, that we are going to see any additional States admitted to the Union. And if 50 years or 100 years from now the question arises, should we as the result of admitting another State increase the membership of the House of Representatives by one or two seats, I hope that the membership of the House at that time will have the same reverence and respect for tradition that I hope we will show we have today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York on the very sound, the very logical, and the very commonsense argument he has made. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], have pinpointed the nub of this thing. The question is one of fairness and equity, fairness and equity to the States involved, and the fairness and equity of the argument presented. The gentleman from New York suggests that there will be rank discrimination against the three States involved if we fail to pass this legislation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I say that if we fail to pass it we would ignore the fact that those three States are just victims of reapportionment. We will be saying we were not going to follow the pattern and custom of what historically happens when States were admitted to the Union.

Mr. BOLAND. And on the basis of historical precedent in every instance where a new State has been admitted to the Union the membership of the House has been increased. Is not that so?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. That is my answer. I think we will be remiss in our duty if we fail to increase the membership of the House.

Mr. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, every Member, of course, has his own opinion of this legislation. I have my personal conviction, and it is this: It would not be before us today if it were not for special privilege being accorded the State of Massachusetts.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], said that somebody would probably ask: "Why do you not clean up the mess in Massachusetts?" Well, why is the mess in Massachusetts not cleaned up? I will yield him a minute of my time or three or four—I can probably get more time—if he wants to answer why the political mess in Massachusetts is not cleaned up.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. The fact is we have had a committee on redistricting in the legislature that formulated plans which were passed by the legislature but there was sufficient influence in higher offices of the State that the Governor did not sign the bill into law. We happen to have that situation up home, but that has nothing to do with the bill. I would still be here advocating the bill and carrying the rule if Massachusetts were not in the bill at all, if it were New York or some other State. As a matter of fact, it follows the historical pattern throughout the years.

The gentleman follows the usual line of always swimming against the stream and throwing darts into things. We know that the present Speaker comes from Massachusetts, and that a former

Speaker came from Massachusetts. I do not think there is any need to throw darts around.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman's answer is that if the Massachusetts Legislature had passed a congressional redistricting bill it would have been vetoed by the Governor. If all legislatures and Governors operated on that basis and the Congress of the United States then bailed out the States that could not settle their political differences we would have quite a time here in Washington, would we not?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact it was not anybody from the State of Massachusetts who attempted to do something to correct the oversight that occurred when Alaska and Hawaii were admitted. But I introduced a bill. The Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on the bill, and immediately after the admission of Hawaii a bill was introduced by myself.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says he feels sorry for those States such as Iowa that have lost Members through redistricting. If this bill had come in at least a year ago as it should, and if the State of Massachusetts had redistricted as it should, there would have been the opportunity to have given consideration to all States, including the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but I do not want the sympathy of the gentleman as on the basis that it was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. We need something more than sympathy.

Mr. JOHANSEN. It is very difficult for me not to extend sympathy to the gentleman from Iowa, but that was not my purpose in rising. I am still trying to seek information. Is it my understanding that the gentleman is arguing that if this matter had been brought before the House at an earlier date the mathematics of the situation would have been different and in consequence there might have been three other seats that would have benefited?

Mr. GROSS. That could be the case, but there is nothing to prevent the Congress of the United States from adding 50 Members, if it wants to.

Mr. JOHANSEN. My question did not go as to what Congress could do. My question goes to the proposition if this is a matter of following the mathematical formula whether it would a year ago have been a different three seats.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know as to that. There will be amendments offered today, and I hope they meet a better reception than they did in the committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the correct answer for the gentleman would be no. If three are added under the equal proportion method, it would be three as a result of the census, and the number could be changed. If it is three, it would be these three; if two, it would be just Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I am saying as to limitations on all States other than these three. But we do have sympathy from Massachusetts, the land of the bean and the cod, where the Lodges speak only to Cabots, and the Cabots speak only to God.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], was the manager of the Alaska statehood bill when it was on the floor of the House for consideration on May 21, 1958. Let me read from his statement, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 7, page 9222, in connection with admission of Alaska to the Union:

The bill provides that until after the next census, the membership of the House would be increased by one; and after the next census the figure would go back to 435.

Continuing, he said:

I have had people suggest, "Well, maybe that might be my seat." With the changes that are going to take place around the country after the next census, I think it is straining at a gnat if we are worrying about what seat will go out as a result of admitting Alaska to the Union.

I have read the RECORD and I found at no point—and I wish someone would correct me if I am wrong—I found at no point that any Member of the Massachusetts delegation at that time rose and demonstrated a single objection to the provision that the membership of the House would go back to 435 following the 1960 census. If any Member of the Massachusetts delegation protested, it having been clearly stated in the debate that the membership of the House would go back to 435, I wish they would tell me where in the RECORD it can be found.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Would the gentleman not also say that it is not straining at a gnat to foresee other States being admitted to the Union?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

This is special privilege legislation. It is designed primarily to take care of the State of Massachusetts. Of course, Missouri and Pennsylvania are included, but they are tails to the kite; they are taken along on the shirttail for the ride, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I scarcely need to say that I am opposed to this bill.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 10264—to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10264, with Mr. FLYNT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the Members of the House that we should increase the membership to 438 because of the admission of 2 States, Hawaii and Alaska, to my mind is unanswerable. Whenever a State is admitted to the Union we always increase the membership of the House. It is only fortuitous that the three States appear to enjoy a preference; namely, Massachusetts, Missouri, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, as is stated in the committee report, the bill would add one Representative each to the delegations from Massachusetts, Missouri, and Pennsylvania, in accordance with the table of priorities applicable under the 1960 census, using the equal proportions method currently in effect.

Mr. Chairman, if we had increased it to any other number beyond 438, those States would still have preference under the table of priorities. That objective table is the only reason why those three particular States appear to have an advantage.

Mr. Chairman, there was an editorial this morning in the New York Herald Tribune which I would like to read, in part:

The addition of three seats can be justified; the admission of new States is both a fair enough excuse and a safe enough precedent. But there is no excuse for adding more.

The chief danger as the House takes it up is that the amendment floodgates will burst open, with everyone who faces loss of his seat through population shifts trying to up the ante to save it. The result could be a House 20 or more Members larger than it is now—and it is too big already.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill increasing the membership to 438, regardless of which States may benefit. I hope that the House will remain impervious to amendments increasing the House membership beyond 438. I say that because of the experience of overpopulated assemblies in Europe. For example, the French National Assembly has 452 members. The Bundestag in Germany has 516. The House of Commons of Great Britain has 630. The Italian Chamber of Deputies has 596. In assemblies of such size the power of the individual member is diluted until it becomes almost minuscule; gives bodies of such size rise to a spate of splinter parties. In the Italian Chamber of Deputies for example, there are seven, eight, or nine different parties. I would not like to see anything like that in this country.

I do not want a Member to be a mere cipher or a nobody. I do not want a particular party or splinter party head to control me and to hold the reins over me. That is what will happen if the House gets too large.

Mr. Chairman, what are we doing in this situation? We have 437 Members today. We are simply increasing the membership by one in order to take care of the admission of these two States. I see nothing dangerous in that. I see nothing wrong in that. I think it would be very worth while to do justice to the States involved and to do justice to this Chamber and to do justice to the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, in order to get a more effective Congress, there are other remedies than unlimited increase in membership that should be adopted. These are to strengthen our personal staffs; to give us an executive assistant to take care of the large amount of work that overwhelms almost all of us; to allow more administrative expenses to each Member; and better travel allowances. Then we will be able to serve our constituents better. But I do not think we should in any way, shape or means, enlarge this Chamber beyond 438. In order to do justice, we do enlarge the House by one, and I think that is a fair arrangement.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10264, a bill introduced by Mr. WALTER, the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation to Congress.

The purpose of the bill, as expressed by House Report No. 1367 on the Walter bill, by the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary is very plain and forthright.

To quote it specifically:

The purpose of the bill is to prevent the recent admission to the Union of the States of Alaska and Hawaii from having the effect of reducing the number of Representatives in Congress shared by the original 48 States, below the number to which those States have been entitled over the past half century.

In other words since the Apportionment Act of 1911, and the admission of Arizona and New Mexico in 1912, and until the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, the number of Representatives in Congress remained fixed at 435. Since that time the population of the United States has almost doubled, and the average number of persons per congressional district has increased from 212,000 to 410,000.

Since Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Missouri would regain a seat under an apportionment to bring the membership of the House to 438, I am convinced that it is a fair and equitable bill.

Certainly the formula advanced for three additional seats to those three States, as priorities, is the same formula used for the additional seats to other States by the Bureau of the Census and a decrease in other instances.

Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Missouri had nothing to say as to the method or formula used, but I wish to point out that the increase in the popu-

lation of Pennsylvania was 821,354 according to the 1960 census, or almost as much as the total population of Hawaii and Alaska of 858,939, combined.

I trust that the House will go along with the suggested increase, particularly since the formula used was that adopted by the Congress itself in 1929.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is extremely important that we get back on the track. After all, this measure is not designed to give Members to any particular State or States. The purpose of this legislation is to provide the Members that should have been provided at the time of admission of Alaska and Hawaii, and no other. I am not personally interested; the State of Pennsylvania has already acted, and no matter what happens to this legislation I will not be affected. I am sure that everybody here can consistently take the position that numbers are immaterial. The sole question is, are we going to do what the committee neglected to do for the first time, if you please, when Alaska and Hawaii were admitted? I know the reason for it.

The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over the question of the size of the House. This is a very delicate question. My bill, which I introduced several years ago, immediately after the admission of Hawaii, received very careful consideration. Many witnesses testified; hearings were carried on over a period of many months. So the committee cannot be charged with being derelict in its duty. We have just got around to action. When this bill providing for the addition of three Members was reported, everybody felt that the real purpose of the bill was to prevent the admission to the Union of the States of Alaska and Hawaii from having the effect of reducing the representation of the other 48 States in the House of Representatives. I have heard it argued that the facilities are inadequate. Now I just cannot conceive of a more ridiculous argument. After all, we have only to provide facilities for one more Member, and I do not think that that is any argument. Nobody knows better than I do how difficult it is to maintain order in this body. I have had the privilege and honor of presiding over the debates in this House for a number of years, and I concede how easy it is for an unwieldy body to get out of control. I share with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the feeling that this membership is too large and ought to be reduced. But, so long as we are concerned only with an equitable proposition, it seems to me that we ought to do the equitable thing at this time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is it not true, if the gentleman's proposal had been enacted forthwith or if it had been enacted a year ago, it would have been the same three States that would have benefited from these provisions as are going to benefit through the adoption of this bill?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, that is so and that was the case at the time the measure was introduced, but we did have some feeling in our committee by people who were interested that if we attempted to do the equitable thing that we are doing in this bill, we might provide a vehicle under which the membership could be increased to a number far in excess of the number that the members on the Committee on the Judiciary feel it ought to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is well aware of the fact that during the 10 years or so of the consideration of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, there was general opposition to increasing the membership of the House by even one Member; is that not true?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman know of any serious effort to bring about an increase in the membership of the House prior to 1960, when the results of the census of 1960 became known?

Mr. WALTER. Well, an attempt to increase the membership was made as soon as it was learned that the representation would be diluted through the admission of these two States.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is well aware of the fact that there has been no attempt to increase the membership of the House by even one, two, three, four or any number until after the census of 1960 was reported. I am not arguing the question involving the three States, but I am raising the question about the other States, within a reasonable limit; it seems to me that at this time to argue for three now is not as it should be and there is argument now I think that we ought to increase the membership by at least 17 or 18 Members. This would be more equitable and more nearly meet the existing situation without an unreasonable increase in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WALTER. I might say to the gentleman that his entire position, in my humble judgment, is based on a false premise. After all, we are not concerned today with a byproduct of what this action may produce; we are not considering in the least that Pennsylvania will only lose two Members instead of three, or that Massachusetts will only lose one instead of two. That is not our concern; our concern here is solely with doing that which the Congress has always done when new States were admitted to the Union.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I think it should be pointed out here—if I am not correct I should like to be corrected—that bills were introduced after Hawaii was admitted as a State before the decennial

census was taken and before it could possibly have been known whether or not any particular State would be affected.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, I understand that is the fact. I understand bills were introduced in 1959.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. May I advise the gentleman that a bill was introduced before the announcement of the decennial census introduced by a member of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. His was the first bill, in fact, to take care of the loss of membership by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I was recognized, I believe, is because I had the not too enviable duty and responsibility as the ranking Republican on Subcommittee No. 3 that had the responsibility of looking for a solution to and trying to make a decision with regard to additional House seats last year.

I do not think there has been an issue before this body in which there were more Members interested, or I might say, a greater amount of interest shown—I will not use the word "pressure," but interest shown—on the part of the membership, and understandably so. But I think the debate is properly taking the focus it should, and it also justifies our inaction last year and our action this year.

Our inaction last year was based on the fact that it was believed by I think a majority of the members of the Judiciary Committee—and rightly so—that simply because some States were going to lose membership and others gain due to census, that fact should not open the door to the creation of an inordinately large House. On the basis of some of the arguments presented to us the result would have been to increase the House membership to 547, if Arkansas were to be taken care of. It is obvious that an increase of this degree could not properly be considered.

Therefore, the issue had to be on the basis of a meritorious consideration, and I think the Judiciary Committee wisely decided that the only meritorious basis that would avoid this too large House, which I think all Members are opposed to, would be to grant three additional seats as a result of the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. A further reason is, as has been stated, that the addition in membership will only be from 437 to 438 instead of from 435, because the House is now composed of 437 Members on a temporary basis. But the proper justification is to take care of those States that are being penalized by the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. Their representation is being reduced by the mathematical effect of the new census which had to take account of the three additional seats due to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. This bill does not name the States but is based on the

established census figures. It is a general formula, and no effort is made to name a specific State. Under the general formula after these States are added, Hawaii and Alaska, then the three States that lose seats would be allowed to retain them. It just happens to figure out that the States are Massachusetts, Missouri, and Pennsylvania.

Those prevented from being penalized are the States of Massachusetts, Missouri, and Pennsylvania.

This has been one of the most difficult problems that ever faced a Member of the House, particularly a Member with as little seniority as I have.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman was here on the admission of Alaska and Hawaii. Does it not seem unusually strange at that time there was a refusal to consider an increase in the House membership, but now, for some strange reason, there seems to be a very great feeling that the Congress made a terrific mistake at that time and that we had better go back and correct it? Can the gentleman explain that action of the Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the Congress itself has the right to take such action as it sees fit at any time, and if the Congress wishes to make an adjustment on the basis of Hawaii and Alaska being admitted to the Union, it has full authority, and in the exercise of its prerogative can add three additional seats. I do not think the Congress forecloses itself on that matter.

I may say to the gentleman also, and I want this clearly understood, I do not consider this as a precedent when it comes to the consideration of the admission of any additional States to the Union. I think the House can judge what it wants to do. If I thought this was setting a precedent, and that this would be committing future Congresses by the action we take today, I would be opposed to it. I do not think it is, and I think on its merits it is justified.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was it not explicit in the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], when he presented the bill providing for the admission of Alaska to statehood, that the intention of Congress was the membership of the House would revert to 435 after the 1960 census?

Mr. CRAMER. The Congress has a right to make a decision at any time which it sees fit to make. I do not feel that I am bound now by any statement the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], might have made at that time or by any action taken at that time. If the gentleman wishes to oppose the bill on that basis, the gentleman can exercise his prerogative, and I would be the first to fight for his right to do so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to understand the gentleman's point, whether this would establish a precedent if we did take this action today because of the admission of two new States. How could we avoid establishing a precedent with respect to new States that may hereafter be admitted?

Mr. CRAMER. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, if Puerto Rico or any other Territory becomes a State, I would not consider myself bound because of what we do today. I think the House Members can decide at that time on the merits of the issue what should be done and, therefore, I do not think it is a question that is before us today.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable trepidation that I arise to speak this afternoon in view of the assaults that have been made on my home State and the questioning of my motives. Believe me, I would not rise today in support of this legislation if my motives were selfish. Far from it.

I have reached that stage in life, with not too many expected years ahead, that I would be guilty of advocating the enactment of a law because some personal benefit would accrue to me. I arise today to support this measure because I believe it is equitable and just.

The States which will benefit by this bill did not jockey for position, to grab an extra seat, as has been stated by some. These three States were next in line for an additional seat on the basis of official Census Bureau statistics and the reapportionment formula. So, I do not think there is any selfishness on the part of Massachusetts; I do not think it is selfishness on the part of Pennsylvania or Missouri that they should press for the addition of these seats in accordance with a century old tradition which provides for additional members when new States are admitted to the Union.

Now, I have been here a long while. I was here when an effort was made in 1930 to increase the size of the House. The size was not increased at that time, but this was no binding precedent. Each Congress is a precedent unto itself.

I shall try to sweep away the fog that seems to be developing. In some quarters, the reason for the presence here of this bill has been attributed to selfish motives on the part of our beloved Speaker. Nothing could be further from the truth. To question Speaker McCORMACK's motives in this matter is unfair, unjust and unworthy of those who do so. He does not need this legislation to be reelected to this House from the State of Massachusetts. He can be reelected either in a single district or at large. He is supporting the legislation because he believes it is right and proper. He believes in fairness and equity and that the bill is justified.

May I say a word in passing? I have been here a long time. I have served with a good many Speakers of this House, and I never saw a man, when he went behind the rostrum to become

Speaker, ever exercise any degree of selfishness or ever attempt to win any personal gain. There is something in the atmosphere of this House of ours which imbues the man who takes over the office of Speaker with a deep sense of fairness and justice. His one purpose is to uphold the honor and the integrity of a great office and the dignity of the House.

Now, it has been stated rather broadly by some of the newspapers that Speaker McCORMACK is doing something that Mr. Rayburn would not have done. I know that is not true. It was my privilege to enjoy a close friendship with Mr. Rayburn, and I honor him for the great and outstanding service he rendered our country. I know he would have agreed to this bill, because I had a long talk with him about it. He said he believed that it was right in equity and justice and that he would approve of it.

If he were alive today, he would have taken the same position that Mr. McCORMACK has. I say this because I do not want to see a Speaker unfairly blamed or his motives assailed. This is not a partisan bill. It is a nonpartisan measure, as much as anything can be nonpartisan. It helps some group and fails to help others, but that is true of any bill that is passed.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should pass this bill, as I said in the beginning, because I believe it is just. I do not believe that adding three more Members to the House, because of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, is of any great significance. This bill merely makes permanent the temporary increase of two which was granted with the admission of the new States, plus the one additional seat to which Hawaii will be entitled after 1962.

This bill is of far less importance to the men and women who are in the Congress than it is to the people of America who look to us for full and effective representation.

The people need adequate representation today more than ever before. The processes of the Federal Government in this age affect every business enterprise, every community—yes, every household in America.

The millions of our people today need Congressmen for their most direct contact with Government, which affects all their lives and activities. Everyone knows that actual attendance at the sessions of the House is only one part of the work we are called upon to perform if we are properly to do our jobs.

So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I hope we will support this bill because it is right and just, and because I sincerely believe it is in the best interests of the country and the people we represent.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the question as to whether we should increase the permanent membership of the House—and if so, by how much—has been patiently and thoroughly explored.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary conducted hearings on approximately 20 bills proposing to in-

crease the size of the House by a number ranging from 2 to 34 Members.

More than a year ago, I introduced a bill proposing that we raise the ceiling on membership from 435 to 453; an increase of 18 seats. As we took the problem of reapportionment under consideration, I sought a reasonable compromise that would be helpful to a majority of the 16 States that were scheduled to lose 21 seats, due to the increase and shift in our national population as revealed by the 1960 Decennial Census.

Last year, the committee was unable to make a choice among these various proposals. It was difficult to determine an increase that would be as fair as possible to the affected States, without making the House so large as to become unwieldy.

On the other hand, a "do nothing" policy would violate precedent, ignore a new and important fact that has a bearing upon the problem; and would reduce the number of Representatives shared by the original 48 States.

Under the 1960 census, Hawaii becomes entitled to two seats and Alaska to one. Unless we add 3 seats, to accommodate the Members from the new States, we would have to absorb them within the present 435 limit. This in effect would reduce the 435 membership apportioned to the 48 States for the past 50 years to 432.

The Senate has already increased its membership to provide for the Senators duly elected from the States of Hawaii and Alaska. If the House should fail to make a corresponding upward adjustment in its size to make room for the Representatives from these new States, we would find ourselves in a contradictory position for which there would be no justification.

It is the sound and established custom of this House to add new Members whenever new States are admitted to the Union. In fact, we recognized this on a provisional basis in the statehood enactment that admitted Hawaii and Alaska to the Federal family. We provided for a temporary increase in the membership until apportionment based on the 1960 census could be determined, at which time the total of 435 was to be restored.

Now that the census has verified Hawaii's entitlement to two seats—and Alaska to one—I believe that the only logical conclusion is to increase the permanent membership by three.

It is plain to see that the statehood enactments of Alaska and Hawaii failed to follow through by anticipating and providing for the impact of their admission, upon the size of the House. As a result, there was a reduction in the number of Representatives to which the original 48 States were entitled. A due consideration of precedent would have prevented this error.

The Apportionment Act of 1911 established the permanent membership at 433, with the specific provision that this would be increased by 1 seat each for New Mexico and Arizona when they attained statehood, which they did in 1912, raising the membership to the present level of 435.

The report on H.R. 10264, dated February 20, 1962, clarifies the issue in this reasonable manner:

The committee is of the opinion that an increase of 3 seats, which will exactly restore the number of seats to which the original 48 States have been entitled, at the same time accommodating the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, is the proper solution of this problem.

In my opinion, the committee, after weighing all the factors, has arrived at a just and practical conclusion, based on solid precedent.

I ask every Member to consider whether the rejection of H.R. 10264, or any amendment of it, can do anything else but weaken the guiding rule that the size of the House of Representatives should be increased consistent with the admission of new States and their populations, to the Union.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, as has been said before, when we admitted Alaska and Hawaii into the Union we provided for a temporary increase in the membership from 435 to 437. But those bills provided that following the apportionment, based upon the 1960 census, the number would go back to 435. That is exactly what is going to happen at the end of this year unless something is done.

Mr. Chairman, based upon the 1960 census, Alaska is entitled to one Member, and Hawaii is entitled to two Members. Therefore this bill would increase the membership next year from 435 to 438, just 1 more than we have at this time. As the report clearly points out, the purpose of this bill is to prevent the admission of these 2 States from having the effect of reducing the representation of the original 48 States below what they have enjoyed since 1911.

So, the net result is that unless we do increase or enlarge the membership from 435 to 438, these 48 States of the Union which were there before these 2 new States, would have to absorb a loss of 3 Members.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, there has been an unbroken precedent for this kind of action. Over the last 120 years each and every time we have admitted new States into the Union we have at the same time provided for membership required by the additional States. I say to the membership of the House that in my opinion insufficient consideration was given to this matter when we passed the two acts of admission for Alaska and Hawaii. I say "insufficient" and stress that word because some Members—I remember, I think, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], called attention of the House to the fact that we would be diluting the original membership unless we did something about it. But that argument fell on deaf ears, or at least the prevailing action at that time was to admit the two new States without sufficient consideration of the impact on the other 48 States.

Mr. Chairman, we hear it said that the effect of the bill is to take care of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. That, I will say to the Members

of the House, is not so. We are just doing through this bill what should have been done when we admitted the two new States. It so happens that according to the rule which has been on the books for a long, long time, the rule of the equal proportions method of representation, if you enlarge this House by one, Massachusetts would get that one. If you enlarge it by two, Missouri gets the next one. If you enlarge it by three, Pennsylvania gets the next. If you enlarge it by four, Illinois would get the fourth seat. If you enlarge it by five, California, now gaining eight, would get another one.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot avoid that rule of priority.

I say to you that it is just a coincidence that these three States are beneficiaries of this bill. And do you know why they are beneficiaries? Because they are the victims of the admission of these two States. If "victim" is an ugly word so is "beneficiary." If you had not admitted Hawaii and Alaska, what would have happened? Massachusetts would have lost only one instead of two seats. If you had not admitted those two States, Missouri would have remained even. As it turned out they lose one. If you had not admitted those two States Pennsylvania would have lost two instead of three. So I say to you that it is just a coincidence of population under the rule that has been on the books over the years that accounts for the three States that each gain a seat. By providing what we should have provided when we admitted these two States, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Missouri became the beneficiaries for the reason that they have become the victim of our not taking care of the situation when we admitted those two States.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. The gentleman knows that the State of Missouri has already redistricted into 10 congressional districts. Section 3(a) of the bill states that the original certification after the 1960 census shall be of no force and effect and the Attorney General of Missouri has ruled that that provision will have the effect of making Missouri go back to the original 11 districts without the necessity of a special session. It is my understanding that the Governor of Missouri met with the committee and with the Committee on Rules and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will introduce an amendment for the committee deleting all after the word "Act" on page 3 so that the State law will control the effect upon the State of Missouri, and Missouri will revert to the original 11 districts as ruled by the attorney general.

Mr. WILLIS. My understanding is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is to offer an amendment, but I am not familiar with it.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no one in this House who has less in-

terest personally in the increase of the size of this House than I do. I have tried to compute it mathematically and I find that before Montana would get another House Member we would have to increase the House by approximately 400. So I think I can approach this on the basis of what I think at least is going to be in the best interests of the country, and certainly what would be in the best interests of every Member of this House.

There are more Members on the floor today than there has been since the debate on the resolution to increase the Committee on Rules. There are more people in the press gallery than when the President of the United States speaks. So there is no question in my mind that there is a great deal of interest in this body in what is going to take place here this afternoon.

A question was raised as to whether or not we would be setting a precedent if the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania were to pass. I say it is not precedent setting. All we are doing is following the precedent set in the past. If we do not follow this precedent I would be inclined to think that we would be setting a new precedent of not allowing fair representation for the States that have been in the Union for a good, long time.

I do not condone the action of any legislature in failing to do what they perhaps should have done.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is not a question of what some State does or does not do. It is a question of what we do. I do not think an editorial in the newspaper, in any newspaper, should make up our minds as to what we are going to do here on the floor. I think this is a question of your individual responsibility. If amendments are introduced here this afternoon, to amend this from 3 to 4 or to 400, I will oppose any such amendments. If we are going to follow the proper precedent, and if we are going to accept the proper premise, it is a question of whether or not the House of Representatives is going to allow Members to be removed from this Chamber because of the admission of a State, or in this case two States. I personally feel it would be a great injustice to the States that are involved here, and I think I can reiterate, I have no personal interest. I was on the subcommittee that listened to the Members plead their case for 2 to 18 new Members, and the subcommittee refused to take any action. We are here now to make a decision based on equity and justice, considering what should be done in this Chamber so far as the representation of the various States are concerned. I would certainly urge support for this bill and for the defeat of any amendments that might be offered.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Just to make sure that the closing remarks of the gentleman are not misunderstood, the gentleman agrees does he not as do the other minority members of the committee that the amendment to be offered by the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania is agreed to by the minority as well?

Mr. BATTIN. Yes, I am speaking of any amendment that would affect the numbers.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Secondly, I ask the gentleman, does he not agree that if the justification for this bill were that it was being done because some States such as Massachusetts was delinquent in failing to redistrict, and I think Massachusetts has been delinquent in that respect, the gentleman would oppose the bill on that basis as it has nothing to do with the question. The question is—the increase in the number of States as the result of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. BATTIN. Absolutely. I do not think there should be any concern here as to what some State has failed to do in its legislature. It is a question of what we should do here as a legislative body to provide for the membership in the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. May I point out to my colleagues that we have heard a very able presentation of the equities of this case from the gentleman from Montana. I want to be associated with his statement. In addition, I want to say that this is not a partisan proposal. This is a matter that was thoroughly discussed by the leadership on both sides of the aisle. There was an understanding of the equities involved. There was an understanding that there would be opposition to any proposal which would increase the membership by more than three. The bill should pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I think it may be well to set the record straight on some of the history of this legislation. We have had the comments here about oversight being responsible for the lateness of the legislation getting to the Congress. I can tell you that that is an incorrect statement. On March 12, 1959, the House passed the Hawaiian statehood bill. On August 21, 1959, the President signed the necessary document decreeing that Hawaii was entitled to statehood.

In order that the record may be straight, on August 18, 1959, I introduced a bill H.R. 8715, in the first session of the 86th Congress. At that time I made a statement on the floor of the House in support of my bill. There are many Members of this body from Massachusetts from Arkansas, and from other States who promptly evidenced their support of the bill. They wrote letters to me and in some cases by letters to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

It seemed to me then that we should deal with this problem at that time rather than to wait until today; the things have happened which we then knew would happen. We were not able to get a hearing on my proposal at that

time. It is interesting that some of those who today so loudly proclaim that the bill should pass were at that time unwilling even to discuss it with some of us who proposed it.

I might point out that on January 12, 1961, I again introduced a bill which was given the number H.R. 2531. It is identical to the bill introduced by me in the 86th Congress. By its terms the House membership would be increased to 438 to take care of the very situation we are talking about today.

I have in my hand newspaper stories written by one reporter published in several papers which he represented. These stories appeared in January 1960 throughout the Nation, saying that at that time we were having difficulty getting any consideration of the legislation by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chairman, there are some people today who are being unfairly accused of having selfish interests. Some of these persons were aligned with those of us who thought that this should have been done before the 1960 census was taken. But some of those men are today properly urging the enactment of this legislation and they are doing it, I am sure, with the same high purpose they had when they were advocating it before the population count was made by the Census Bureau.

I am frank to tell you that I am not pleased with the legislation because of these things that have happened. I think that I am compelled to support it because I took this position before the contest and the controversy arose. I would hope that we could take care of other States since I am sure that no one can deny what has happened.

This Congress cannot escape the accusation that we are taking care of three States. It is indisputable that we are doing this because of our tardiness in doing that which we should have done before the issue had reached the point it has now reached.

I must again correct those who say it was an oversight. If it was an oversight, it was an oversight on the part of those who at that time were not affected and who were not willing to look at the facts as they were. I hope that all of you will look upon this legislation without being too quick to criticize some of these gentlemen from Massachusetts—and I am not here to defend Massachusetts—because I can say to you and I can show you in my files letters from gentlemen from Massachusetts on the Republican side of the aisle and letters from gentlemen from Massachusetts on our side of the aisle supporting this legislation back in 1959.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 10264, which, if enacted into law, will increase the membership of this House from 435 to 438 Members.

This bill is justified. Probably the strongest of the reasons which are advanced for this legislation is the fact of

the three Members who are added to the House by virtue of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the sisterhood of States in this great Union, and for whom we temporarily increased the membership when they were admitted.

The present permanent membership of 435 was set long before statehood was considered for either of our newest States. Therefore, since their admission gives us three new Members, as determined by the 1960 census, it is only fair that such permanent increase in membership be recognized and provided for by this proposed legislation. This was done in former years where States were admitted. In this case, it should have been done when Alaska and Hawaii were admitted, but since it was not done, it is only fair to do it now.

I hope this bill is passed.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure which is bipartisan in nature, just in application and consistent with all the precedents on this subject since the founding of the Republic.

There has never been the time since 1789, when the first apportionment act was formulated, that new States supplanted the seats of existing States. This bill, by merely accommodating the three seats to be occupied by Hawaii and Alaska, falls in line completely with these precedents.

I would suggest that the House of Representatives would be a strange institution, as indeed would any family or community, if in welcoming in new Members it would dispossess those who are already Members. That is why it has never been done before and I trust will not be done today. Whatever action is taken on this measure will have its impact on other States 10 years hence—and we do not know now what States might be affected at that time.

As long as new States were brought into the Union, the membership was enlarged. This was specifically provided in 1872, 1882, 1891, 1901, and 1912. The last increase was subsequent to the 13th census of 1910. The Apportionment Act of 1911 fixed the membership of the House at 433 Members with the provision that if Arizona and New Mexico entered the Union before the next apportionment they each should have 1 Representative. Both became States in 1912 and the membership was thus increased to 435, which has continued to the present time.

The only rights we have in this body is a reflection of our rules and the precedents established throughout the years. While a single incident would not establish a precedent under the rules of the House, repeated action since the time of our Founding Fathers does firmly entrench these precedents. If we abrogate custom which has been repeatedly and uninterruptedly confirmed, then our rights have been undermined. If these guarantees, born of tradition, are now overruled by a majority, then hereafter we can expect that the minority on any issue or point of order can well be the victim of the caprice and machina-

tions of those who have the votes to do whatever they desire. I do not believe, and pray, that that day will never come to pass. In Jefferson's Manual it very wisely states:

The Speaker feels constrained in his rulings to give precedent its proper influence since the advantages of such a course are undeniable.

This we should not forget today.

I have read with great care the debate which took place on this floor on April 27, 1911, when the House was last increased. The vote in favor of the measure was overwhelming. Even the arguments used then against that proposal carry no weight today.

It was said then that an increase in the membership would require considerable construction costs to accommodate new Members. Certainly an increase of only one Member over the present size of the House does not pose this problem.

It was said that the House would become too large and unwieldy. Certainly one more Member could not have that effect.

Those who favored the bill indicated that the representation of the people was becoming diluted. Then, each Member served an average of only 211,000 constituents. Today, it is more than double that number, and considerable more, by a factor of four or five, than exists today in many countries abroad. I would have been amenable to a somewhat larger increase but I realize that that view is not widely shared.

In the 1911 debate, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Census who handled the bill, Congressman Houston, of Tennessee, stated:

It is quite likely that in the future there will be a demand for an increase of Members and I think it more than probable that there will be an increase. It is, I grant you, well to keep that increase as small as possible.

I would suggest that an increase of only one over the present number fulfills that suggestion.

Hence, I believe this bill should pass. It is fair, just, and meritorious. It follows the clear-cut precedents of time. It is bipartisan and has received the clearance of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I trust it will receive your support.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill and should be defeated. This is a political expediency bill. It is a seat grab bill and a special privilege bill. It is a bill which rewards civic irresponsibility and it sets a dangerous precedent.

Ever since 1912 the membership of the House of Representatives has stood at 435. Repeated attempts to increase the membership have failed. Now there is a proposal to add three additional seats to bail out the politicians in certain States by awarding such States one new seat. Such procedure is not a popular move with the 13 States, including Iowa, which have reapportioned in good faith. Certainly this is a sterling example of rewarding civic irresponsibility.

Nine States rightfully gained seats as the result of the 1960 census. It is difficult for me to see how Members of Congress from any of these nine States can vote extra seats for three States not entitled to them. Twenty-five States neither gain nor lose seats. Certainly, these States have nothing to gain by voting a seat to the three States who are not satisfied with the results of a fair apportionment.

Sixteen States losing seats should have the keenest interest in this flagrant act of favoritism. They should rise up against this gross discrimination.

How can anyone from Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Arkansas, Mississippi, California, and the rest of the 13 States of this country which are losing congressional seats, possibly vote for the bill?

Does this legislation mean that every time we have a census we are going to add new seats to the House of Representatives under some guise or another and then justify such action because some States did not do their redistricting job right? If this procedure continues in further years, whereby we add new congressional seats on some flimsy excuse or another, we will finally wind up with an unwieldy legislative body that simply cannot operate properly. I suggest you give heed to the establishment of such a dangerous precedent by voting against the resolution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the enlargement of the House of Representatives because I believe this proposal goes counter to efforts for better government.

The proposal to increase House membership by three or more must be considered a seat grab which would dilute the representation from States like my own.

New Hampshire now has 2 Representatives in a Congress of 435 Members. It had not always been thus. A century and a half ago New Hampshire had 6 Representatives in a House of Representatives of 186.

As the population of New Hampshire failed to increase in the same proportion as the increase in population for the whole Nation, we accepted the necessary reduction in our Members in Congress.

The problem today is that some States are unwilling to accept that reduction. The net result will be that although New Hampshire—and 46 other States—are not supposed to suffer a reduction, our representation will in fact be reduced because as the total number of Representatives will increase, ours will remain the same.

Moreover, we are setting a precedent for future enlargements of this House. Most students of good government argue that the present membership of the House is too large for efficient government. Recent studies, one of which is cited in the report of the Judiciary Committee, suggests that ideally this House should have 300 Members—not 435 as at present.

Every enlargement tends to make legislative procedures more unwieldy. We are faced with the prospect that the House of Representatives will become a formless mass of people, hampered in its constitutional role to enact laws for this Nation.

Since 1912 there have been steady increases in our population, but no change in the total Members of the House. Now each time there is an increase in population, or each time a new State is added to the Union, there will be strong arguments for increasing the total membership of the House.

In the interest of good government I am opposed to this proposal.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those Congressmen whose district has been gerrymandered or rockymandered out by sordid New York State Republican politics. While misery generally loves company I do not share such feeling. Injustice to one does not mean that injustice must be done unto others.

I have always been against injustice to my fellow man or political enemy. I support this measure, H.R. 10264.

When I voted for the admission of Alaska into the Union on July 7, 1958, I did not intend that one of my colleagues from Massachusetts should be eliminated because of my vote. When I voted for the admission of Hawaii in March 1959, I did not intend that two of my colleagues in Pennsylvania and Maryland should be eliminated. When I voted for the admission of those States, my intention was to add two States to our Union, to add two stars to our flag, to make our Nation a greater nation to spread democracy and not to deprive three colleagues of their seats or the opportunity to return and serve their State and country. This measure is non-partisan. I trust that this measure will pass.

This body is a great institution, with a sense of innate justice. I have witnessed it for the 6 years I have been here. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an opportunity and a great chance for this body to demonstrate its sense of justice, especially to the Members of its own family.

Mr. Chairman, despite the obstacles which have been thrown before my path, I shall try to return in the next Congress. I hope and trust that the membership of this body will support this measure and render justice to those colleagues of ours who will be affected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the Eighty-eighth Congress and in each Congress thereafter, the House of Representatives shall be composed of four hundred and thirty-eight Members.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRIMBLE: On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "thirty-eight" and insert the words "sixty-seven".

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I live up in the northwestern corner of Arkansas where the hills are steep and the flint rocks are sharp. When I was a boy and wanted to go opossum hunting, if the leaves were still, I would have to lick my fingers and hold them up to see just which way the wind was blowing.

As of this moment, it is not hard to discern how you feel, but I hope you will change your mind because, after all, this is a fair body, a just body. I think it was 1911, as someone said a while ago, when this House was enlarged the last time. I am not a bit sore at Massachusetts. I love everyone there. I do not think this is a trumped-up scheme. I am not mad at anybody in Pennsylvania. I am not mad at anybody in Missouri, and I surely do not want anyone mad at me in Arkansas. But, seriously, this amendment that I offer increases the House by 32.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 25 or 30 years the population of this great country has increased, about doubled. I remember when I was sworn in here in 1945 I sat down by a man I did not know. He asked me where I lived. I told him. He said "I know that district. I have been there many times. The fact is I spend my summers at Bella Vista." He said "Did you ever have any legislative service?" I said "No." He said "Do you think you want to get reelected?" I said "I do."

"Do you think you will like it here?"

I said, "I hope so."

Finally he got around and said, "Well, if you want to get reelected—" I cannot use the exact language because it would be outside the rules of the House; but anyway he said, "Work hard and keep your mouth shut." And maybe I ought to do that today. But he said, "When I came to this Congress 32 years ago I brought along a lovely little daughter of one of my dearest friends. I did not need her. We sent home some garden seed, and I just brought her along because I loved her folks and she was sweet." And he said, "In 1945 I will have 10 daughters of dear friends and 2 sons of daughters of friends, and all of us cannot keep up with the work."

So, the load of the Congress has increased. It is heavy now, so what I am striving for is for this amendment to be passed so there will be more Members and the population will be divided and that the load of legislation will be held down to where we can handle it. Some of the rest of my colleagues may find themselves in the same situation.

But this amendment is offered without the slightest malice. I do not blame Massachusetts. I know what the speakers who have preceded me have said, and what they have said is true. It is not just for the 3 States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. But the rest of us need some help and I surely hope that you folks just this one time will vote with me. And I thank you very much.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in the same spirit as that of my dear and good friend from Arkansas. I want to add a little explanation to his proposal for the consideration of the House. I said awhile ago that I view this bill as one to restore to Massachusetts, Missouri, and Pennsylvania what they had lost as a result of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii. There is a great temptation to go beyond that. An argument can be made for it and I respect all my colleagues who are involved in this situation.

But in order to take care of Arkansas here is what we would be voting for. California, for example, gains eight Representatives as a result of the 1960 census. If we adopted the amendment of my dear friend, California would get those eight and three more. And so on down the line. If we adopt this amendment, in order to take care of Arkansas we would have to increase the total membership by 32, including increases to States that are already gaining, and 13 more seats before we can make up one of Arkansas' loss. That is the unfortunate thing about this situation.

That is why I prefer as chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation to stick by the precedents and to recommend to the House that we follow what was done throughout our history and to do what should have been done when we admitted Alaska and Hawaii to the Union; namely, to provide for the requisite number of Members and not to penalize and take away from the representation of the 48 States that were members of the Union before the admission of the two new States.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, through reapportionment and subsequent redistricting, the Maine congressional district which I have had the high honor of representing in this House of Representatives has been consigned to the casualty list.

I immediately hasten to assure my colleagues, however, that I rise in support of the amendment—providing for a House membership of 467—by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] not out of self-interest. More fundamentally, it is because of a serious concern for something far more significant and deserving of consideration—the interests of every individual citizen which each of us here today are privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States.

In short, the basic question today is this: To what extent shall we, against the background of reapportionment, permit the voice of each and every one of our American citizens to be heard?

The problem for us to resolve here today becomes eminently clear when it is realized that as our American population increases, the influence of each element of the population decreases or increases in proportion to the size of the U.S. Congress. As the size of the Congress increases, so does the representation of each individual in the American society. Conversely, as the size decreases, so diminishes the individual's control over the affairs of his Government.

It is not, of course, a very easy thing to determine what number of citizens one Congressman is capable of representing in an efficient manner. And still, in a large sense, that is what we are here today to resolve. And it should be remembered that this House was, by our Founding Forefathers, constituted to be infinitely responsive to the will of each of the elements of our population.

It is highly questionable that a mere increase of three in the membership of the House of Representatives would act to preserve the potency of the individual in his control over his Government, or that such a minute increase would serve to provide each and every American with viable representation.

I am not possessed of sufficient wisdom to certify the precise number of representatives that would satisfy the very reason for this House's being. I feel confident, however, in suggesting that a House membership of at least 467 would perform to give each citizen of the United States a voice of substance in Government and that this number would not provide a base for confusion in the House of Representatives.

I plead with my colleagues to give this vital proposition their most serious deliberation, thereby endeavoring to determine in what degree their constituents should be represented in this House of Representatives.

The will of this House will, in due course prevail, in the instant matter. I remind my colleagues, however, that this bill before us does not provide our citizens with a significantly louder voice in the affairs of Government.

In this respect, I commend this amendment to the attention of my colleagues, for I ardently believe it would serve to provide each American with substantial representation in the House of Representatives, and it would do this without making this great deliberative body unwieldy.

My colleagues from Maine, Congressman MCINTIRE and Congressman GARLAND would like to associate themselves with my remarks. Both gentlemen have commitments in the State of Maine today. I request that Congressman GARLAND be permitted to insert a statement in the RECORD following my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman TRIMBLE.

If, 51 years ago 100 million people justified 435 Members in the House, certainly the 83 million additional people in the United States today are entitled to this modest increase.

Historically, the House of Representatives was created as the body which is closest to the people. If we keep increasing the population of each Member's district, we will someday reach a point where, because of the paperwork involved alone, we will no longer be able to legislate properly and still maintain personal contact with our people.

Since Maine became a State in 1820, we have seen our membership in the House of Representatives decline from

a total of eight down to three. Unless the amendment offered to increase the size of the House is passed, Maine stands to lose another seat next year as a result of the 1960 census.

Mr. Chairman, Maine is a State approximately 30,000 square miles in area and with a population approaching 1 million people. Surely, these people can be better represented here in Washington with three congressional seats rather than two.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote favorably to increase the House membership to 467.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have often heard it said that nobody's mind was ever changed in this body by listening to the debate. Well, if that be the case, this may possibly become a red letter day because I must confess that I learned a great deal today by listening to the debate, and that at this point I am considering the question carefully.

I came in here having read newspaper editorials which predisposed me against the enlargement of the House by three Members because I had read that this was a device to pull somebody's political chestnuts out of the fire, that it was a political grab, and I saw something sordid about it.

But in listening to the debate I heard it argued that really this is not a bill to enlarge the size of the House in that respect; it is said to be merely designed to compensate for the three additional seats required by the admission—and by the fortunate admission, I might add—of Hawaii and Alaska. Frankly, I am puzzled by the varying claims.

However, if we go beyond these 3, whether it is 4, 14, or 62, or whatever you add in that numbers game, then we are surely playing politics. There may possibly be justification for the three to compensate for the additional seats of Hawaii and Alaska, but if you go one step beyond three, you are surely engaging in partisan politics and you are saying to the American people that what you are really interested in is to preserve political jobs.

I urge you to defeat this amendment. If this amendment passes, it will be impossible for me and for many others even to consider the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, certainly we would be establishing a precedent were we to enlarge the House of Representatives to the extent suggested in the amendment. However, I believe a good historical case has been laid down for the increase of the membership by three.

I wish to pay recognition to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who said that he would like to look into greater effectiveness of the House of Representatives insofar as committee staffing is concerned, and also the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who said that he hoped the size of this body could be cut

down. I think these are two proposals to which we should give our attention and I believe if the majority party will put their minds to it we could think in these terms for the future. I would like to suggest that when they do so they consider the rights of the minority so that when establishing committee staffs that the minority be far better represented than it is today.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in the coming of the space age we will have a problem for there may be many present nations, provinces or islands that could apply for statehood. It seems not too farfetched to think that in the years ahead we might be able to go to the top of this building, take off in a spacecraft, have lunch in London and be back the same day. The point I am trying to make is that we should at some future time go thoroughly into the organization of the House, the number of Members, and consider a deliberate plan of improving the effectiveness of this body through administrative changes and committee procedures rather than simply adding additional Members every time a new State is admitted, for it is not hard to visualize that someday there might be far more than 50 States in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto now cease.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and I am not going to take the 5 minutes allotted me. I take the floor only because I think we have overlooked one approach that might come in for some consideration. That is the approach to establishing membership of this House on the basis of the volume of services which the Federal Government renders. You know, when the figure of 435 Members in this House was established, this was 1 Member of Congress for approximately each 500 Federal employees. Today there are 5,000 Federal employees for every 1 Member of the House. I am not suggesting a formula to equalize the differential in this comparative ratio. However, we may assume as a result of this increase in the number of Federal employees that there are 10 times the amount of Federal services being rendered. I assume further that the work of every congressional office is in proportion to the services rendered by the Federal Government. While it is too late to do anything about it in the bill this year, and because I may not be around the next time a reapportionment bill comes up, I suggest to the House this might be food for thought as a formula for future action of this body as far as establishing the number of Members of the House is concerned. Perhaps at that time Congress can reassume certain of its

constitutional power and authority which in the last 25 years it has turned over to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is timely. It is timely for the reason, among others, that the new \$80 million House Office Building is not yet completed. Coming at this time, if there are additional Members, it offers an opportunity to use the space that would be dedicated to a swimming pool to provide offices for some new Members.

If the amendment is adopted and the membership substantially increased, there are other features of the construction across the way that could well be altered.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on this bill a very important matter has been overlooked. It might very well be that nothing can be done about it in the way of amendment to the bill. However, it certainly ought to be considered by the Judiciary Committee at the appropriate time in separate legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I called the Immigration and Naturalization Service and found that 3,038,304 aliens were registered in 1961; that in Hawaii alone there were 50,101. If these aliens had not been counted in the apportionment, we would have the equivalent of 7 or 8 more Members of Congress representing American citizens.

I was surprised when I learned what the problem really was. However, I found that a number of Members of Congress did not realize that aliens were counted in this apportionment. I do not see how we are justified in taking care of just three States, due to the fact that the Congress brought in two additional States, without giving consideration to taking care of other States who lost representation due to the counting of aliens. Aliens have no right to representation in the U.S. Congress. Yet they do have, inasmuch as they are credited to the States in which they reside for apportionment purposes of the House of Representatives. I just want to point out to the House that even though it is too late to do anything about it in this bill, I hope before the next census comes around some legislation can be had in the House of Representatives to deal with this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, with due deference to everyone, I do not think this bill is fair or good for the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 51, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 2a) is amended by striking out "the then existing number of Representatives" and inserting in lieu

thereof "four hundred and thirty-eight Members of the House of Representatives".

SEC. 3. (a) The statement transmitted to the Congress within the first week of the first regular session of the Eighty-seventh Congress by the President in accordance with subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, as amended, and the certificates sent to the executives of the States in accordance with subsection (b) of such section 22 shall be of no force and effect for the purpose of effecting a reapportionment under such section 22 of such Act of June 18, 1929.

(b) Within thirty days of the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement prepared in accordance with the provisions of such Act of June 18, 1929, as amended by this Act, and such statement shall, for the purposes of such Act of June 18, 1929, be held and considered to be the statement submitted in accordance with the requirements of such Act for the apportionment of the Eighty-eighth and the four subsequent Congresses.

(c) Where a State has redistricted after the 1960 apportionment but before the effective date of this Act, such redistricting shall not be invalidated by this Act if the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled has not been affected by the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That a State which has redistricted after the 1960 apportionment and which becomes entitled to an additional Representative by this Act may either redistrict after the effective date of this Act or shall elect the additional Representative at large.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 3, line 1, strike out all after the colon and insert a period.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee intends under this amendment that Massachusetts, which has not redistricted, and Pennsylvania, which redistricted under the 1960 apportionment, shall redistrict if the committee amendment is adopted, or elect their respective delegations at large, and that the redistricting action taken by the State of Missouri, pursuant to the 1960 Apportionment Act, shall be of no effect.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The amendment is agreed to by the minority as well as the majority. It also assists the situation with respect to the State of Missouri, and permits them to return to their previous districts in existence prior to the elimination by recent legislation which was requested by the Governor. Therefore I think it is agreed to—there is no question about it—by the Missouri delegation and it is on their specific request as well that this amendment is being considered.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I think this amendment will accomplish the objective of the legislation of limiting the increase in Members of the House to three. I therefore rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the committee amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 3, line 2, after the comma, strike the remainder of that line and all

of lines 3, 4, 5, and 6 and insert the following:

"That a State which becomes entitled to an additional Representative by this Act shall redistrict within 30 days after the effective date of this Act or forfeit the additional Representative."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment very well speaks for itself. I think these States ought to redistrict, and redistrict immediately, if they are to be the beneficiaries of this action this afternoon.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman explain the constitutionality of such a provision of forfeiture?

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps I should say I am glad I am not a lawyer, but what is unconstitutional about it?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I asked the gentleman whether he could support his amendment with any constitutional precedent. It proposes a forfeiture, and you do not want a State to forfeit a Member in this House, do you? Where is substance or authority for any such action as that?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman if he would repeat so that we may understand what the effect of this amendment would be in a State like Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The effect would be that the redistricting provided for by recent action of the legislature would be nullified and it would be necessary for the State to redistrict again. And if it did not, then under title II of the code, 2a(c) enacted in 1929 all of the Members would have to run at large.

Mr. CORBETT. Does not the present law provide that in the event a State secures an additional Representative and fails to redistrict only one Member will run at large?

Mr. WALTER. Let me read the applicable section of the statute:

Until a State is redistricted in the manner provided by the law thereof after any apportionment, the Representatives to which such State is entitled under such apportionment shall be elected in the following manner: * * * (5) If there is a decrease in the number of Representatives and the number of districts in such State exceeds such decreased number of Representatives, they shall be elected from the State at large.

Mr. CORBETT. In view of the State's action—and I am just asking for clarification—when a State has already passed a redistricting bill, if this amendment prevails it would have the effect of declaring that law null and void, would it not?

Mr. WALTER. It would supersede that law. This would then be the law.

Mr. CORBETT. The present redistricting law?

Mr. WALTER. That would be the effect; that is right.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, in view of that I do not believe that we should compel the government of the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to proceed on a certain activity, and that is what the effect of this amendment would be.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Do I understand that the effect of this amendment, with respect to the situation in Pennsylvania where we had a special session of the legislature and reapportioned congressional districts into 27 seats, would be that we would have to have another special session?

Mr. CORBETT. That is what the gentleman tells me.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Or else everyone in the State runs at large?

Mr. CORBETT. That is what he is saying.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The question arises as to what time the amendment speaks of. That is what I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania. When does it go into effect? That is the real question here, because then what the gentleman's amendment says is that those States receiving extra Members must redistrict again from the time that the statute goes into effect with the gentleman's amendment in it.

Mr. WALTER. The statute goes into effect when it is signed, of course.

Mr. FULTON. In Pennsylvania you would have to have another redistricting after signature by the President, even though we have redistricted already and might want to run one Member at large.

Mr. WALTER. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. CORBETT. And the last date to file in Pennsylvania is next Monday, March 12.

Mr. WALTER. The attorney general of Pennsylvania and the Governor of Pennsylvania are aware of this situation and they have advised me that a careful perusal of the law discloses that the new Reapportionment Act may be enacted at any time within 60 days of election.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, in Pennsylvania people have already filed for Congress in the districts which now exist. I talked to the bureau of elections this afternoon at Harrisburg and there is some doubt as to the constitutionality of any further act of redistricting in Pennsylvania, because people have already filed for Congress under the present districts. How about that?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know what provision of the constitution the gentleman is talking about, but what this proposes to do is entirely legal and proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I obviously do not want to cut off any discussion by the distinguished gentleman,

and I will be glad to yield to him in just a moment. The objective of this amendment, I might say to the Members of this House, is to make sure that it will accomplish what the gentleman from Iowa desires; namely, that the State of Pennsylvania must redistrict, if it is going to get this additional Member. There has been considerable discussion with regard to the proposed amendment to the amendment, and I will say this—in my opinion, the amendment to the amendment is totally out of order in that the total concept of adding three House Members has not been one of reward or because a given State has lost its representation.

If we were going to do that, we would increase the total membership to 547 to take care of all States losing membership. This we obviously cannot support. Concerning the amendment to the amendment it was considered, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, as another means of accomplishing what we intended to accomplish and it could not be supported on the merits. If it were, you could end up with a situation where Massachusetts, because it goes ahead and redistricts, gets this additional seat, but the State of Pennsylvania or the State of Missouri would be denied their seats, and particularly the State of Pennsylvania because it did not redistrict. That would not be consistent with the formula that has been used, the equal proportionate method, and that would not be consistent with the objective of doing equity, namely, providing three additional seats because of the admission of the two new States. This amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa was given serious consideration by the minority, in particular at the time we were attempting to tie down this agreement. We understand there is agreement with the Governor. We understand there is agreement with the attorney general that the State is, in fact, going to consider areas where there are problems in Pennsylvania, and I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in order to accomplish this, the legislature is going to have to reconsider the present districting if they are going to accomplish that in areas where they have serious problems. If they agree to do this, it is our position that the legislation involved should require it, and that is why the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was proposed and that is why the minority accepted it. If there are going to be new seats, we do not want the States to receive them on the basis of a bonus. Rather it is being done in the interest of equity both to the three States and the members presently seated in those States.

This agreement has been made and if it is going to be lived up to, and if it is lived up to consistent with the Governor's and the attorney general's amendment, then there will be no harm done to any other seated Member in the Pennsylvania delegation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee, the State

of Missouri that will get the first Member will now go back to its original membership under the 1950 census. The State of Pennsylvania that under the 1960 census lost three Members will under the proposed law get one Member who will run at large unless the Governor of Pennsylvania calls another special session of the legislature and they can agree to redistrict. The State of Massachusetts, not having redistricted, can go ahead with its redistricting plans.

In the State of Pennsylvania the last date to file petitions under the law as it is on the statute books today will be Monday, March 12, 1962. This bill we are now considering cannot be passed and signed by the President by Monday. There are 27 seats in Pennsylvania. The effect of the Walter amendment will be to throw out all of the petitions that are filed and declare all those petitions null and void. Then the 28 Members of the next Congress from Pennsylvania will all have to run at large unless the Governor of Pennsylvania calls another special session of the Pennsylvania Legislature and they can agree on a new redistricting plan. For myself and the other Members from Pennsylvania who now represent a district, we have no desire to run at large in our State.

I urge that the amendment to the amendment and the amendment itself both be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 117, noes 94.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WALTER and Mr. SAYLOR.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 121, noes 65.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10264) to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress, pursuant to House Resolution 555, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 128, noes 54.

So the amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

IMPACT OF COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection. Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Gen. Robert W. Porter, our representative at the Permanent Military Deputies Group, Central Treaty Organization, Ankara, Turkey, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

FEBRUARY 28, 1962.

DEAR GEORGE: This brief note is to transmit to you letters of congratulation which I have received from my Pakistani and Iranian colleagues here in Ankara. Truly, the Turks, Iranians, and Pakistanis were much excited by this successful exploration into space. It is having quite an impact on their thinking.

USIS received a 16-millimeter film of the Glenn flight this morning. A CENTO study group composed of 40 officers from the 5 countries was in session here. The film was shown to them at noon. The film is a fine one and they were all much impressed and pleased to see it. USIS did a fine job in getting the short film here so soon.

Regards,

Sincerely,

R. W. PORTER, Jr.

Lieutenant General, U.S. Army.

One of the letters is from the Iranian representative, Permanent Military Deputies Group, Central Treaty Organization, Ankara, Turkey, and reads:

FEBRUARY 21, 1962.

DEAR GENERAL PORTER: Last night, owing to a faulty telephone line in my house, I was unable to express my joy and delight at the success of your first orbital space flight, which is not only a success for America, but indeed for the whole free world.

Believe me in saying that the entire free world rejoices in the success of that brave pioneer of space flight, Astronaut John Glenn, who orbited the earth three times.

I will now avail myself of this opportunity to express my heartfelt and most sincere congratulations on this brilliant and magnificent accomplishment, and wish NASA, under the watchful eyes of your young and determined President and the freedom-loving people of America, all the success for their future projects.

Please accept yourself, and be good enough to convey, if you are in correspondence with our mutual friend General Rogers, the best wishes of Mrs. Batmanglidj, myself and the Iranian officers in Ankara, who are all striving for a common and noble goal, for this wonderful achievement.

N. BATMANGLIDJ.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter from Lt. Gen. Sarfaraz Khan MC, Pakistan's permanent military deputy to CENTO:

FEBRUARY 22, 1962.

Lt. Gen. ROBERT W. PORTER, Jr., U.S. Representative, Permanent Military Deputies Group, Central Treaty Organization, Ankara.

MY DEAR PORTER: I offer you and through you to all our American friends my own and wife's heartiest congratulations on the successful completion of John H. Glenn's epic voyage into space and his safe return.

This historic event has thrilled the hearts of all mankind to which your friends and well-wishers claim the major share. As a result of this outstanding achievement every American can justifiably hold his head up with pride and dignity and we who are closer to you feel highly elated and share your well deserved joy and happiness.

With the kindest personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

SARFARAZ KHAN.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, March 7, when there was voting on rollcall No. 30, my name appears as one of the 31 "not voting." The occasion of my not voting, Mr. Speaker, was caused by the fact that, while I had been in attendance on the floor of the House at all times until a few minutes before this roll was called, my secretary notified me there was sudden illness on the part of one of my immediate relatives at my home in Arlington, and I was wanted there at once; that no one was with person ill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, before I left the floor I left a message that I was called from the floor for the reason above set forth, and asked for active pair "aye" for bill number H.R. 132 to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish Federal matching grants for construction of television facilities for educational purposes. I would have voted "aye" if present. Because there was no active pair available to me I must needs bear the record of not voting as shown on page 3555 of the Record.

Mr. Speaker, I naturally regret my absence even though it was absolutely necessary for the reason stated. Up until this first "not voting" record I believe I have 100-percent voting record for all "yea" and "nay" rollcall votes from the opening day of this 87th Congress.

STATEMENT BY HON. KENNETH E. BELIEU, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR INSTALLATION AND LOGISTICS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you and all the other Members of this distinguished legislative body that at the open meeting of the House Armed Services Committee this morning, the statement by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics, Hon. Kenneth E. Belieu, in support of naval fiscal 1963 military construction authorization program was as follows:

There is a \$9,196,000 project for the construction of a 500-bed hospital at Long Beach, Calif. This project is a result of long-term studies by the Navy, Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget. It will provide beds for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force personnel, including dependents.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to state that I am very certain that this naval project for the construction of this 500-bed hospital at Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., is known to me personally to be a result of long and diligent studies by the Navy, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. I am able to do this because over 2 years ago, at the request of the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Hon. CARL VINSON, I made a field survey of naval hospital facilities in the Los Angeles County area and also including the Riverside County area. This study and survey took me not only to the Corona Hospital in Riverside County, a former naval hospital facility, but to El Toro, Riverside, March Field, San Pedro, and the naval hospital ship at Long Beach harbor. It also gave me the benefit of hearing the analytical statements made during that survey by representatives of the Navy, by representatives of the Department of Defense, and by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget. Much of my survey was in company, presence and participation of these distinguished gentlemen.

I will not at this time say anything further, Mr. Speaker, but when the occasion arises and the matter of authorization and appropriation of this \$9,196,000 is before this legislative tribunal I will ask further opportunity to give this House the benefit of further factual knowledge of the situation which entirely justifies the Navy in recommending this 500-bed hospital project at Long Beach to commence at as early a date as possible. Not least of all I am pleased to have the presentation made before the Armed Services Committee on yesterday that "It will provide beds for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force personnel, including dependents." I believe it is true to fact that there is no area in our beloved Nation that has been and is more in need at this time, and which area is much justified as it will be to authorize and construct this hospital which is to be used by those entitled thereto in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, including their worthy and legally entitled dependents.

SURPLUS MACHINE TOOLS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and to

include extraneous material in the form of a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith a report made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which shows that 5,191 machine tools of various kinds were made available for educational institutions during the period July through December 1961.

The acquisition cost of the machine tools is shown as \$8,854,118, however the machines are of incalculable value since they are placed in trade schools, industrial schools, and engineering schools across the Nation. Many of the tools are placed in institutions in redevelopment areas thereby aiding in the training of skilled workers and the forma-

tion of a base for defense contracts and other industrial enterprises.

It should be observed, Mr. Speaker, that this public use of the public's property has proved to be of much greater long-term value than sales of surplus property which bring but a few cents on the dollar to the Treasury and often adversely affect the Nation's economy.

I want to emphasize at this time the fact that suggestions are now being made which would result in the substantial elimination of this valuable and productive program of donating property to public and charitable institutions in favor of sales of property which would amount to distress sales and would bring very little monetary return. From the history of the pertinent legislation, I am confident that Congress would view such a departure with alarm and I trust no steps will be taken to disturb the present functioning of the donable program. The full report follows:

Machine tools allocated for donation during the 1st half of fiscal year 1962 (includes both Government-owned tools and contractor termination inventory tools)

FS classification	Types of machine tools	1st quarter, July through September 1961		2d quarter, October through December 1961		Total, July through December 1961	
		Number of tools	Acquisition cost	Number of tools	Acquisition cost	Number of tools	Acquisition cost
3411	Boring machines.....	4	\$14,916	13	\$40,826	17	\$55,742
3412	Broaching machines.....			1	8,843	1	8,843
3413	Drilling machines.....	472	503,466	245	280,440	717	783,906
3414	Gear cutting and finishing machines.....			2	4,746	2	4,746
3415	Grinding machines.....	428	649,955	329	430,251	757	1,080,206
3416	Lathes and screw machines.....	408	1,355,474	285	1,086,056	693	2,441,530
3417	Milling machines.....	234	1,797,563	155	814,743	389	2,612,306
3418	Planers.....	3	11,875	4	6,191	7	18,066
3419	Miscellaneous machines (such as shapers).....	693	457,844	296	241,652	989	699,496
3441	Bending and forming machines.....	247	173,806	136	73,359	383	247,165
3442	Presses, hydraulic and pneumatic (power driven).....	27	31,767	19	12,899	46	44,666
3443	Presses, mechanical (power driven).....	29	27,787	27	10,253	56	38,040
3444	Presses, manual.....	118	49,786	64	25,475	182	75,261
3445	Punching and shearing machines.....	162	142,186	80	62,735	242	204,921
3446	Forging machines and hammers.....	2	375	1	1325	3	1,700
3447	Wire and metal ribbon forming machines.....	1	193			1	193
3448	Riveting machines.....	2	1,000	1	3,174	3	4,174
3449	Miscellaneous secondary metal forming and cutting machines.....	25	20,798	18	11,323	43	32,121
3422 through 3439	Miscellaneous tools, other items in group 34 not specified above.....	434	269,962	226	231,074	660	501,036
	Total.....	3,289	5,508,753	1,902	3,345,365	5,191	8,854,118

CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, time and again we have called for more imagination and initiative on the part of the free world to win mankind to our side in the struggle that will determine whether freedom or communism shall prevail.

So far we have failed to utilize the great potential of people-to-people communication, to expose the Communist record of betrayal and cruelty; and by contrast, educate the victims and the dupes of communism to the fact that freedom is the only way in which they can live their lives as human beings, and not as the pawns of despotism.

Our colleague, Representative PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey, has revealed one way in which we can overcome our inertia, and stir the minds of men again with the constructive revolutionary faith in progress through freedom.

In the February 15 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he told us of the little-people-to-little-people program that began when his young son decided to write to Premier Khrushchev with the thought that if he gets a fallout of letters, he might stop the fallout of bombs.

He spoke to his chums about it; the idea spread rapidly, and it was not long before hundreds of children were writing to Khrushchev. The non-Communist world understands and is touched by this spontaneous plea on the part of youngsters. But older people who have witnessed the aggressions and the treacheries of communism are certain that any appeal based on reason or mercy will be interpreted by the Communists as a sign of weakness, and will

only whet their appetite for world domination.

As Representative Rodino says:

The project that we feel will be most effective is a massive worldwide effort, started here in the United States, to discredit and destroy the myth of communism in the minds of men throughout the world. We believe that an important task in this project is to enlist the youngsters of our Nation into this political warfare which we didn't start, but which we do have to fight.

Congratulations to Representative Rodino for pointing to the road ahead.

As the struggle against the tyranny of communism will continue for decades to come, our young people must be given the best preparation to overcome the threat.

The best protection against communism is to know the nature of the enemy.

Our children must be taught to recognize the symptoms of this disease, what it feeds upon, and what is required to prevent infection or to cure it.

They will learn of communism's contempt for religion and human values; the devious tactics it employs to confuse and subvert; and how it enslaved its present victims before they realized it. To grow up to the healthy life of freemen, our youngsters will need to know and honor the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States; the way our representative form of government has developed to meet every challenge in a changing world; our system of equal justice under law; the rights and responsibilities of freemen; the great achievements of an open society, as well as its greater potential.

So that—armed with truth—they may bring hope and help to those who want to live as independent men and not as creatures of the state.

The average person does not speak the mystifying language of diplomacy that is employed in the dialog between governments.

Thousands of miles—and other artificial barriers—separate Ivan and Sonya in Moscow from John and Mary in New York, but they have far more in common than governments that are concerned with mass issues and impersonal programs can comprehend.

Homes, children, food, jobs, family budgets, friendship, individual problems and hopes; these are the main interests and the daily language of Russians in Kiev, and Americans in Kalamazoo.

This is the area of understanding we have neglected.

Only people-to-people communication can dispel fear and encourage confidence and cooperation.

The diplomats call it a *modus vivendi* between nations; the people call it getting along with one another or live and let live.

Even under communism, public opinion cannot be ignored.

Through all the crosscurrents of international tension and the awesome instruments of destruction that dwarf the individual, and his ability in concert with others to control them, Representative Rodino has reminded us of the latent power of the people—East and

West—to reassert human and spiritual values.

People-to-people communication will develop the practical wisdom to solve the problems that threaten the family of man.

EMBARGO ON TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, when the President issued his proclamation on February 3, 1962, declaring an almost total embargo on trade with Cuba to prevent the flow of American dollars to that country, our Communist-dominated neighbor only 90 miles off our shore, I am sure his action met with the complete approval of my colleagues and the freedom-loving peoples of this and other nations.

However, I, as Chairman of the Select Committee on Export Control established by House Resolution 403, recently learned that on the advice of the Treasury Department the embargo does not include articles manufactured in third countries from raw materials produced in Cuba such as cigars manufactured by third countries from tobacco of Cuban origin.

In an effort to clarify this matter, I directed the following letter to the Honorable Robert H. Knight, General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, under date of February 28, 1962, and received a reply from him under date of March 7, 1962, which I also quote:

FEBRUARY 28, 1962.

HON. ROBERT H. KNIGHT,
General Counsel
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNIGHT: In the proclamation of the President on February 3, 1962, dealing with an embargo on trade with Cuba, it is stated in part:

"Hereby prohibit, effective 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, February 7, 1962, the importation into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba; and I hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out such prohibition, to make such exceptions thereto, by license or otherwise, as he determines to be consistent with the effective operation of the embargo hereby proclaimed, and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to perform such functions."

Information has come to the attention of this Committee that the Foreign Assets Control Division of your Department recently ruled that goods, including cigars made from imports from Cuba, may be imported into the United States from countries considered friendly.

It is requested that you supply this committee with the following information:

1. Has the Foreign Assets Control Division of your Department made such a ruling?
2. Furnish the date such a ruling was made.
3. Supply any information available as to the volume of any goods of Cuban origin being imported into the United States at the present time from other countries.

4. Is there existent any legal authority to preclude such imports into the United States?

5. Under what authority was the ruling made?

6. Any other specific details you may be able to furnish to fully clarify this ruling. Your prompt attention to this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

A. PAUL KITCHIN, *Chairman.*

THE GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 7, 1962.

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Export Control,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of February 28, 1962, you requested me to supply information to your committee in answer to a number of questions relating to the proclamation of the President on February 3, 1962, dealing with an embargo on trade with Cuba. The questions are answered below in the order in which they were asked in your letter:

1. The Foreign Assets Control of the Treasury Department has not issued a ruling, but in answering inquiries has pointed out that the proclamation of the President, and the statute under which it was issued, do not prohibit the importation of goods, including cigars, manufactured in third countries from raw materials produced in Cuba.

2. The above answer was given in reply to a number of inquiries, commencing shortly after the issuance of the President's proclamation.

3. In accordance with instructions to collectors of customs, no goods of Cuban origin, within the meaning of the proclamation, have been or are being imported into the United States with the exception of a few shipments specifically licensed by the Foreign Assets Control because payment for them to Cuba had already been made prior to the proclamation of the President.

4. The Presidential proclamation prohibits the importation, except pursuant to license, of goods of Cuban origin. Authority exists under section 5(b) of the act of October 6, 1917, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. 5(b), to prohibit the importation of goods manufactured in third countries from raw materials produced in Cuba. (See answer to question 6.)

5. See answer to 1 and 2 above.

6. In accordance with judicially established principles of customs law, the term "goods of Cuban origin" does not include articles manufactured in third countries from raw materials produced in Cuba. An article is determined to be manufactured if it undergoes a substantial transformation. Thus, for example, cigars produced in a third country in whole or in part from Cuban tobacco are considered to be manufactured in that third country and would not be considered, under the court decisions mentioned above, to be of Cuban origin.

The objective of the Presidential proclamation was to deprive the Castro Communist regime of foreign-exchange earnings in the United States which might be used to finance subversive activities. We are carefully watching import statistics for any changes in the pattern of the U.S. trade with other countries which may result from the embargo. So far it does not appear that there has been any significant increase in importations of cigars manufactured abroad from Cuban tobacco. If it appears from this or other sources that the objectives of the embargo are being frustrated by the importation of goods manufactured in other countries which contain Cuban raw materials, then appropriate action will be taken to fulfill the objectives of the embargo.

I am enclosing herewith for the information of your committee copies of the Treasury Department regulations issued on February 7, 1962, implementing the Presidential proclamation. I trust that the information given above will fill the needs of your committee. If not, we will be happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. KNIGHT,
General Counsel.

To me this is a back-door approach, enabling Cuba to obtain a supply of hard cash, and thus further assisting that Communist-dominated country to continue her aggressive subversive campaign throughout Latin America. This represents a cloudy situation that probably cannot be understood by our freedom-loving peoples of the world who have a sincere desire to halt the continued spread of international communism. Further, I am sure that our domestic tobacco manufacturers cannot understand it.

I will seek further facts relative to this back-door approach to determine whether anything can be done about it.

PRESIDENT'S REASONING ON EXPROPRIATION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY IS UNSOUND

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in his press conference the President assailed those of us who dared to challenge the action of a governor in one of the states of Brazil in seizing an \$8 million property belonging to the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. The President claims we should not be critical of the Government of Brazil because of the actions of one of its governors. I am confounded by such naivete on the part of our Chief Executive. Perhaps his attitude explains the failure of our foreign policy. Evidently he has no intention of pursuing policies which will protect American lives and property anywhere in the world. Evidently he believes that any illegal or immoral action against the United States or its people should be ignored because it may offend some part of the Government responsible for such action.

Every Latin American expert has been warning us that Brazil is very close to going over completely into the Soviet camp. This expropriation was accomplished by the brother-in-law of the President of Brazil, a man whose muscle put the present head of Brazil in power and yet our President asks us to believe that the leader of that country has no control of and no responsibility for the action.

I believe the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for Congress and the American people to let our President know that we are no longer in a mood to sacrifice honor and prestige, the only real guarantees for peace, for sniveling ac-

quiescence in Communist takeover of country after country.

As a part of these remarks I would like to include the article from this morning's Washington Post explaining the President's position.

KENNEDY ASSAILS IDEA OF BARRING AID TO BRAZIL OVER PHONE EXPROPRIATION

President Kennedy said yesterday that he could think of nothing more unwise than a proposed congressional resolution barring aid to Brazil because the unfriendly governor of one of its states has expropriated a U.S.-owned phone company without full compensation.

At his press conference Mr. Kennedy said the issue—involving an International Telephone and Telegraph Co. subsidiary and Gov. Leonel Brizola, Governor of Rio Grande do Sul—was under negotiation between the United States and Brazilian Governments.

He went on to term unwise a resolution "which puts us in the position, not of disagreement with a governor of a state, who is not particularly our friend, but, instead, really, with the whole Brazilian nation, which is vital and which is key" to U.S. relations in Latin America.

The company involved contends the compensation offered is far less than the value of the phone concern. Mr. Kennedy said there is no dispute over expropriation, "providing the compensation is fair."

He stressed the importance of Brazil, by far the biggest Latin American nation, and noted that its President will visit here in April. He said that the United States should "keep a sense of proportion" about this case, adding that "we don't want to make (the work of) those who dislike us . . . easier by reacting to things which happen in a way which strengthens them and weakens the influence of the United States."

ANSLEY WILCOX HOUSE, BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, early in this session I introduced a bill for the acquisition and preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site.

This is one of the oldest houses in Buffalo, and it is one of only four sites outside of Washington, D.C., where the presidential oath has been administered. The people of the city of Buffalo have expressed a genuine desire to cooperate on a nonpartisan basis in bringing about the preservation of this landmark as a national shrine.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excerpt from a brochure prepared by an interested group of citizens in Buffalo, emphasizing the importance of this dwelling and its preservation as a historical site which should be of equal interest to the city of Buffalo and to the Nation as a whole:

TO PRESERVE A NATIONAL LANDMARK IN BUFFALO—PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S INAUGURAL SITE AND A DISTINGUISHED ARCHITECTURAL MONUMENT

The Ansley Wilcox House, located on Delaware Avenue in Buffalo, is nationally re-

nowned as the place in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States, September 14, 1901, following the tragic assassination of President McKinley. It is one of only four sites outside Washington, D.C., where the Presidential oath has been administered, the others being the old Subtreasury Building in New York City, where George Washington was inaugurated for his first term; Philadelphia's Congress Hall, the scene of Washington's second and John Adams' inauguration; and the homestead in Plymouth, Vt., where Calvin Coolidge was sworn in. The house is thus a national historic landmark of utmost significance.

Vital as is the preservation of this shrine for the history of the Nation, its preservation is equally vital for the history of Buffalo. The Wilcox House was originally one of the officers' houses of the Poinsett Barracks, which were established in Buffalo in 1838, following the Patriot War or Upper Canada Rebellion, when feelings were still running high. The Poinsett Barracks were maintained by the U.S. Government as a military post until the Mexican War. They occupied the area bounded by Delaware Avenue, North, Main, and Allen Streets. As constructed, the post consisted of a central parade, with the company barracks on the north and south, the stables near Allen Street, the guardhouse and main gate at Main Street. The officers' quarters which faced on the parade, were built along Delaware Avenue. Of these structures the Wilcox House alone, in greatly modified form, has survived. Originally a double house, it was occupied by the post surgeon, Dr. Wood, whose wife was the daughter of Zachary Taylor, later President. Gen. Bennet Riley was commandant of the post at one period, later to distinguish himself in the Mexican War and as provisional Governor of California.

The house is thus now in part nearly a century and a quarter old, and is one of the oldest dwellings in Buffalo. Architects and architectural historians, concerned at the loss to our national culture heritage of so many buildings in recent years, value the house as an important example of postcolonial architecture, a building that should be preserved. The National Trust for Historic Preservation and the American Institute of Architects are supporting the imperative matter of preserving this house.

After the U.S. Government relinquished the Poinsett Barracks, the Wilcox House was occupied successively by a number of prominent Buffalonians, including Joseph G. Masten, Albert P. Laning, and Frederick A. Bell. It was the residence of Ansley Wilcox at the time his friend, Theodore Roosevelt, took the Presidential oath in 1901. Ansley Wilcox was a Buffalo attorney and civic leader of national reputation, distinguished for his contributions to the developing field of social work and to the movement for civil service reform at all levels of government. He was a leader of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo (a pioneer among such organizations in the United States), active in obtaining lands for the New York State Reservation at Niagara Falls, in the movement for jury reform, in State ballot reform, in sponsoring the plan to separate municipal from State and National elections to the end of removing city affairs from the influence of State and National politics, and in the review of public health laws. His influence, expressing itself directly in local activities and in his membership in the councils of national organizations, had national effect in stimulating the movement for comparable reforms and causes in many places.

WKCR COMES OF AGE

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week one of New York City's great radio stations is celebrating its 21st birthday. WKCR, the radio station of Columbia University, has been in the forefront of educational radio. Beginning in a dormitory room with 14 students broadcasting, the station now has seven studios, three control rooms, a news room, a record library, and serves the entire New York metropolitan area. WKCR plans to apply to the FCC for a construction permit and authorization to increase its power to 21,000 watts. If approved, the station in October 1962 will be the most powerful FM station in the northeast.

Besides the valuable experience and training Columbia University students have gained by operating the station, which is done without faculty supervision, WKCR has performed an invaluable service to the community by the high quality of its programming. It is the only FM station in New York City to broadcast the complete proceedings of the U.N. General Assembly during 1960, 1961, and 1962. WKCR exclusively recorded and broadcast the 1959 Radner lectures delivered at Columbia University by former President Harry S. Truman. Interviews of President Kennedy, Speaker McCormack, Senator Humphrey, and many other national leaders with Columbia University students have been presented.

Presently WKCR is presenting a series of programs which examine current issues on civil liberties and the Bill of Rights. On March 1 WKCR began a series of lectures by the controversial philosopher, Ayn Rand. During this session WKCR initiated a series of great artists recitals broadcast live from the Columbia campus with such noted artists as Claudio Arrau, Garry Graffman and Leonard Rose. Every Thursday evening the station broadcasts a series called Capitol Hill Report in which the activities of the Congress during the past week are reviewed.

In recognition of the public service role of the station WKCR has received a \$500 grant from the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation to be used next fall for a series of programs examining the issues of disarmament.

The radio station of Columbia University is a fine example of the benefits to the public of educational radio. By bringing important issues, events, and personalities into the homes of many, it has increased the education and awareness of our citizens. WKCR and similar stations are serving democracy well. Yesterday we passed a measure to provide Federal aid to educational television. The role of educational radio should not be overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, WKCR deserves our encouragement and congratulations for enriching the lives of its listeners and for contributing so much to the cultural understanding of New Yorkers.

NEW TARIFF AND TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] seeking recognition?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, does it take unanimous consent to withdraw the request for engrossment of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman withdraws his request, we can proceed with the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for an engrossed copy of the bill H.R. 10264.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield, Mr. Speaker, for that purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, was it necessary to get unanimous consent to withdraw a request for an engrossed copy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was not, but the objection was tantamount to a demand for the reading of the engrossed bill, which any Member can make.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, is the House in session tomorrow, or was there agreement to go over until Monday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that there has been no agreement on that subject.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] may revise and extend his remarks following my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] may revise and extend his remarks; and that following that, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to get an engrossed copy back with expedition, say in an hour or 2 hours?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that it would take longer than that.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks arranged for by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], the gentleman from California [Mr. URT] may extend his remarks; and that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE NEW TARIFF AND TRADE BILL

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, we have been deluged in the past several months with incessant propaganda favoring the new tariff and trade bill. It is about time that those who have some questions about it enter the discussion.

One aspect of the new bill that is given a great deal of attention is the proposed negotiations with the Common Market of Europe.

The whole bill, H.R. 9900, represents a drastic departure from previous trade agreements legislation. But the proposal relating to the Common Market is probably the most drastic of all, because it would in a few years lead to complete elimination of import duty on some important foreign-made products to the injury of American products, without any offsetting relief.

I think it is imperative that we learn the various possibilities, and what is implied in this projected relationship with Europe. There are really two aspects. One relates to trade. The other is political and could produce far-reaching consequences, such as unrestricted immigration after a few years.

The Treaty of Rome which is the basic agreement on which the Common Market rests, provides for the free movement of workers from country to country, and a common social security. U.S. alignment could extend this to the United States.

Whatever denials may be made now, we may be sure that the present tariff proposal represents no more than the thin edge of the blade to make an opening. After that the wider opening of the door will be regarded as easier.

What we face is a proposal that in 10 years' time would down-level the United States, in order to meet Europe on her way up. However, this would not be all. The next step would be more down-leveling to meet the underdeveloped countries on their way up.

A reading of the literature of the State Department and allied agencies such as

AID, the Peace Corps, and so forth, leaves no doubt that this is the grand design of our evolving national policy. The relative well-being of this country is regarded with discomfort and an apologetic stance, other people may envy us, and unless we share our progress with them, they will combine with Russia and take our leadership and well-being away from us.

There are those who make the bald assertion that this country could not survive any other course. First, of course, we must align ourselves with the Common Market. If we do not do so, we will suffocate in the world alone. If we do so, we will be able to stand off Russia.

However, we know from numerous statements that this is not the final goal. This goal would be the same as it is even if Russia evaporated and vanished from the scene. Russia merely offers a very handy excuse.

We have already witnessed how certain distant goals are approached. We have a perfect example in the Trade Agreements Act itself.

For years it was the avowed and widely declared policy, reaching from President Roosevelt to President Eisenhower, that it was not the purpose of the trade agreements program to injure or jeopardize domestic industry. This no-injury policy was openly and expressly supported by Secretary of State Hull and all his successors and assistants, as they testified successively over the years before the committees of Congress, namely, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

In recent years the failure of these many promises has become clear beyond further concealment. The escape clause that was provided by Congress to assure proper machinery through which the solemn avowals could be kept, became in effect the burial ground. Only 10 percent of the more than 100 complaints brought before the Tariff Commission during the past 12 or 13 years succeeded in obtaining a remedy against injury, in the form of tariff increases.

Even the paltry number of these cases that succeeded caused gnashing of teeth among the one-world element who never did sympathize with the purposes of the escape clause. They deplored the very existence of both the peril point provision of the act and the escape clause.

As I was saying, the Members of Congress were becoming aware of the failure of the escape clause and a large number of them, possibly a majority, have been ready to do something about it legislatively.

Now, instead of honoring the promises of the preceding Presidents, we find a change of direction.

No extension of the Trade Agreements Act as we know it is proposed. It is abandoned; and with it the no-injury policy.

Thus does the one-world free-trade element propose to run out on Congress now that Congress has caught up with their maneuvering. This is the group that is behind the new bill and making all the billowing noise.

Now, let us get this point. We cannot understand the maneuver and the holowness of the new promises unless we trace the continuity of the policy of these promoters of the new trade program. They have not changed position at all. They have been trying to destroy Congress' constitutional jurisdiction over tariffs and import duties, and they have been against congressional strings on the State Department powers all along. They were merely singing their chorus in the wilderness.

Now, without being elected, they are in power.

When they say that they seek merely an alignment or an association with the Common Market they are peddling sleeping pills. This is not their goal; possibly not even a way station.

Let us assume that Congress gave them the power they have prevailed on the President to ask for. There is a good prospect that in a few years' time they would be capable and ready to do what they are now doing; that is, unabashedly repudiating past promises. They would think, and probably rightly so, that if Congress was simple enough to grant them unlimited powers in the face of the record under the escape clause, Congress would get what we deserve, namely, exclusion from the exercise of power over foreign commerce. The provision of the Constitution that vests the Congress with power to make the tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce has been treated with contempt and would now be brushed aside if H.R. 9900 were passed as written.

Only a shadow of the peril point would remain and the escape clause would be pushed back to the 1-yard line and might as well be forgotten. The proposal to substitute adjustment assistance for the preventive and remedial measures, that is, the peril point and the escape clause, would be to substitute Federal subsidies or handouts and support from the Treasury for the system provided by Congress. It would drive both industry and labor that are overcome by low-wage import competition into the arms of the Government. Dependence on Federal assistance would, of course, carry with it Federal control and direction.

During the past decade Congress has legislated with the intent of strengthening, rather than weakening or eliminating the escape clause. The new proposal flies in the face of this position and seeks with one fell swoop to reverse it. In this sense and in this sense alone the proposal may be described as "bold." I should say that it is presumptuous rather than bold or imaginary.

Association with the Common Market would not stand alone, as I have already said. Every tariff reduction that we would make to the six Common Market countries would be extended automatically to all the other non-Communist countries including Japan and Hong Kong, India, and so forth. It would also include Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

The power to reduce tariffs another 50 percent would mean virtually dismantling what is left of the tariff. Its pro-

TECTIVE effect has already been reduced about 80 percent since 1934. In many instances it is already too low. On a number of important items complete elimination of the tariff is proposed. All items on which the tariff is now only 5 percent or less would be subject to this; also tropical woods of several varieties and an unknown number of products that have until now been largely traded between this country and the Common Market. Chemicals and machinery and automobiles are thought to be in this category.

What seems to be overlooked is that free trade in these products must inevitably also be extended to the other countries mentioned. Before long Japan would be challenging the European countries in this market and would probably drive them out.

Contrast this proposal with the refusal of a number of the European countries to extend even the GATT-reduced tariff rates to Japan.

This is why I say that H.R. 9900, the tariff bill, as now written, is a blueprint for the down-leveling of the United States, with our commerce regulated not by the Congress, and not even by the State Department, but by an international organization that is already in existence, namely, the OECD or Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The way was paved for this last year when the other body ratified U.S. membership in that international organization.

The intent must be obvious. It is not trade with Europe that is sought. That is a smokescreen. It is free trade, with the sacrifice of a number of American industries, and the removal, relocation and retraining of thousands of victimized workers.

Our imports from Europe increased by 300 percent from 1950 to 1960. Our exports rose by 112 percent. This does not look like a restricted trade.

Meantime employment in a number of important industries in this country has declined. Industrial employment has fallen behind our population growth. How will our industries grow as they must, in order to put our fast-growing labor force to work, if our industries are to be confronted with the prospects of sharpening import competition as this bill would invite?

Mr. Speaker, when imports have increased 300 percent in 10 years from the Common Market, further tariff reduction, with extension of these reductions to other countries, would represent slaughter of our industries. The question is: To what end? For what purpose? What is behind the proposal? Where did it come from? On what philosophic base does it rest?

I think some of these questions have already been answered; and the answers are not reassuring to those of us who wish to maintain both our industrial system and our constitutional system. These are strong words but strong words are called for. The President has been subjected to a propaganda squeeze the like of which is seldom seen. Instead of legislation to weaken and destroy American industry, we need legislation

under which our industries could face the future with confidence. Instead they are offered an outlook of discouragement and a bleak future.

This was bad enough already, and hundreds of our industries have gone overseas for insurance against what they not only see coming, but for what in many cases is already here; namely, rising competition from abroad that enjoys many advantages that are not available to domestic industries.

Whatever may be done in respect to reducing tariffs, there still remains a great obstacle to impede and hinder our trading with the Common Market countries—and for that matter all other countries. That obstacle is our inability to compete price-wise with manufacturers in Europe, Japan, and other foreign manufacturing countries.

Their cost of production is considerably lower than ours.

They not only are taking our foreign markets because of lower prices—they are also taking over our domestic market here at home. Look at the European automobiles on the streets and highways.

Look at the textiles in the stores and shops.

In this connection I call your attention to the following comment from the March 8 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

IMPORTANCE PLAYED DOWN

One major industry affected, the automobile business, tended to play down the importance of the agreements. "Tariff cuts in themselves aren't going to mean a great deal to a U.S. car maker," says a spokesman for Ford Motor Co.'s international division. The cuts mean reductions of up to \$200 in the price of an American car in the Common Market nations, and even more in the United Kingdom. But these cuts are so slight a percentage of the cost of the car that most makers don't expect to add many sales. To illustrate: In France, an American compact such as Ford Motor Co.'s Comet sells for \$4,789; a typical French small car costs about \$1,200.

And in some nations the cost of a U.S. automobile will rise because of the tariff agreement. In Germany, for example, a Comet sells for \$3,859 against \$1,100 for a German-made small car. But in Germany the current duty on a U.S. compact is less than the new rate of 22 percent, so the car's price will rise as the levy goes up. Added to this is the fact that Europe hasn't been much of a market for U.S.-built cars for a long time; in 1960, only \$31 million of autos were shipped to Common Market nations, and shipments in the first 9 months of 1961 were 17.3 percent below the 1960 pace.

I have received a letter written to me on March 1 by the president of the Atlantic Steel Co. in Atlanta presenting facts which call for serious consideration as we try to solve these problems. The letter is as follows:

ATLANTIC STEEL CO.,
Atlanta, Ga., March 1, 1962.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE DAVIS: I realize there are many aspects to the import competition problem which you must consider to properly represent your constituents and give full consideration to the problem of what is best for the American economy. I would be unfair to my company's 1,600 employees and

2,200 stockholders, however, if I did not again call your attention to the seriousness of this situation. To cooperate fully with our friends abroad will inevitably lead to business failures in the United States and a general deterioration of our economy.

I am sure you agree that the American steel industry, as well as individual companies such as ours, should not be dismissed as expendable and of no consequence in our American economy or our national security. I am therefore taking the liberty of giving you some figures recently available on our 1961 experience with foreign competition:

In 1961 imports of barbed wire into the United States amounted to 82,446 tons. Domestic shipments, from all U.S. mills, were only 73,981 tons. Imports therefore accounted for 52.7 percent of the total barbed wire market.

We imported 245,211 tons of wire nails last year. American mills shipped 331,619 tons, making imports 42.5 percent of the nail market. (Over 20,000 tons were imported from pro-Communist Yugoslavia.)

The administration's proposal to cut tariffs in half, including the already negligible levy on steel, can hardly be expected to help our steel industry. Our experience last year with the European Common Market was:

[In tons]

Country	Imports from	Exports to
Netherlands.....	51,282	18,465
Belgium-Luxembourg.....	1,076,819	12,833
France.....	332,034	7,243
West Germany.....	522,860	82,266
Italy.....	47,726	78,587
Total.....	2,030,721	199,394

Total imports last year of all steel products were 3,322,526 tons. Exports were 2,228,559, with about 20 percent going to Canada and almost 10 percent to Pakistan.

I hope you will find these figures of some interest and perhaps be of help to you in considering this vital problem.

Cordially,

HOWARD B. JOHNSON,
President.

We will have to reduce our costs if we are to compete, or other countries will have to bring their costs up to ours. We have no control over the latter. We must exercise our powers at home in this country.

Let us look at the difference in costs in different lines of merchandise in this country as compared with foreign costs and prices.

In 1960 we imported \$14 million worth of shirts, mostly from the Far East. In this country the factory cost of a shirt would be from \$1.50 to \$2. On this basis the \$14 million of imports would have meant from 7 to 10 million shirts. Actually the number was 24 million imported shirts, or 58 cents per shirt.

Now suppose that we undertook to export shirts at our prices. The results have not been very favorable. Against imports of \$14 million we exported a little below \$7 million of cotton shirts in 1960.

Sewing machines offer us another example. In 1960 we imported \$28 million worth. We exported 37,000 machines valued at \$2,236,000 or \$60 per machine. The imports amounted to a million machines and were valued at \$28 compared to our export value of \$60 per machine.

Yet another example is found in portable typewriters. Imports in 1960 were \$16 million. This was 436,000 typewrit-

ers or \$34 per machine. This was equal to 40 percent of our own factory shipments. Compared with the import price of \$34 per machine the domestic portable was shipped at an average price of about \$70. We exported 8,575 portable typewriters compared with imports of 50 times as many.

A final example is the portable radio. We imported \$56 million worth in 1960. How many radios was that? It was 6 million, at a cost of \$9 each. The wholesale U.S. price by the manufacturer was about \$25 per set. We exported less than a hundred thousand while we imported 6 million.

The list could be continued to include a large number of products.

What can we expect with the disparity in costs?

It will do little good to induce other countries to reduce their tariffs, especially since the reductions granted to us will also be extended to many of our foreign competitors.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this tariff bill as written would not help our exports because it would make us no more competitive abroad than we are, while it would greatly increase imports by opening wider our market.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] and to say that I agree with his position.

This is no time to plunge headlong into more tariff reductions, with all caution and nearly all safeguards thrown to the wind. On the contrary. The employment problem, not merely just now, but in the years ahead, with more than a million new workers joining the labor force each year is entirely too serious to justify a wider opening of the doors to competitive imports.

We know that today, with our reduced tariff rates, imports are already the cause of much unemployment. Scores of industries from coal, glass, pottery, and bicycles to textiles, athletic goods, carpets, wool, tile, fish, and many others, have been badly hurt by imports; and we must not make the mistake of thinking that the direct displacement of workers by imports represents the only damage to employment caused by imports.

Many an industry has not expanded as it would otherwise have done and has therefore not hired additional workers because rising import competition killed the market prospects. It is a well-recorded fact that in industry after industry in the past 10 or 12 years imports rapidly captured increasing shares of the market, sometimes reaching as high as 50 percent, and even more. Under these circumstances any industry would have been foolhardy or irresponsible to expand by adding plant capacity or building new plants.

The turning down of the damper on expansion has not been confined to a few small, inefficient industries. I have only to ask, how much has the steel industry expanded in the past 10 years? How much has the automobile industry expanded? The fact is that instead of expanding in this country the automobile

industry has expanded abroad. The Ford Motor Co. preferred the prospects in England for capital investment over the outlook in the United States and in 1960 sent \$365 million into the automobile industry there rather than investing it in this country.

So far as employment is concerned the trend has been downward in both the automobile and the steel industry. This meant that these giant industries were not only not absorbing their share of the million and several hundred thousand oncoming new workers each year but were actually adding to the number of unemployed.

If these two giant industries that are noted for their advanced technology, mass production and industrial leadership have been unable to contribute to the solution of the unemployment problem how could we expect the import-vulnerable smaller industries to do so?

One of the retarding influences has been import competition. Rising imports, beyond discouraging domestic expansion, also compel automation and the installation of labor-saving devices as a means of reducing costs.

The destructive effects on employment inflicted by competitive imports have been most clearly demonstrated in the textile industry. In that industry, battered by rapidly rising imports from Japan, Hong Kong, and Europe, employment fell sharply. Again, not all of this decline was caused by imports but more of it than is generally acknowledged. Had the automobile and steel industries been divided into as many individual firms, ranging from small to medium to large, with many of them specializing in particular products that were particularly hard hit by imports, as was the case in the textile industry, they too would have suffered more than they did. This is not a plea for bigness. It is merely an observation of the destructive effects produced by rising import competition ranging over a broad line of goods, as happened in the textile industry.

This is also not to say that the textile industry suffered because of inefficiency. The very fact that import competition caused company consolidations and mergers to improve the competitive position merely demonstrates how this competition led to action that resulted in throwing people out of work. Automation and cost-saving steps can come too fast for the absorptive power of the economy, especially if the same pressure exists in many areas simultaneously. Each community and industries have employment problems of their own. They do well to pick up their share of the new additions to the work force, let alone hiring the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious that one cannot simply look to greater productivity per man-hour as a means of solving our employment problems. We may indeed achieve growth in this manner; but this growth may go hand in hand with less employment. There is much evidence of this. Industry after industry in the past 10 years has increased its output while employment

either declined, stood still, or grew less rapidly than the output.

The bituminous coal industry provides one of the best examples of what a great leap in productivity may do. The output per man-hour from 1950 to 1960 was increased from 6.7 tons per man per day to 12.2 tons. This was an increase of nearly 85 percent.

Unfortunately this phenomenal increase in productivity did not lead to more consumption. It merely prevented the demise of the coal industry. Production dropped from over 500 million tons in 1950 to 412 million tons in 1960, or about 20 percent. This was bad enough, but employment hit a toboggan slide, falling from 415,000 in 1950 to 170,000 in 1960, for a drop of 59 percent.

This shows how wrong we can be when we simply assume that all we need to do in order to meet the import problem is to become more efficient. This might work except for one thing, and that is employment. In the case of bituminous coal the rise in productivity was so great that we were even able to export coal to Europe to the point where they put on restrictions; but oil and gas development held down the domestic market. The result was a drastic drop in employment.

In other instances, instead of competing products preventing a growth of the market, imports produce the same effect. When a domestic industry installs labor-saving devices in a desperate effort to avoid being driven out of its own market by imports and succeeds in holding its own because it has reduced its costs, it will inevitably throw people out of work. It will help swell the unemployment rolls, rather than absorbing its share of the new workers looking for jobs each year. It will contribute to the hard core of unemployment rather than helping to relieve it.

Mr. Speaker, we should get over the faulty notion, so often expressed even by leading businessmen, that all that we need do to meet our import problem and to avoid being pushed back in our export markets by our foreign competitors is to become more efficient, to sell harder, and so forth. Again, this would be fine except for the employment angle. Greater efficiency helps only when it leads to greater consumption of the product. Unfortunately even when greater consumption takes place, which is not always true, it will not add to the number of workers employed in this country if imports are gaining in their share of the market, as is so often the case.

Net unemployment then results. The workers displaced by machinery are not replaced because fewer workers can now produce the total output.

There is a completely false notion that discouragement of industrial expansion by imports is limited to the smaller and less efficient industries. This is not true.

We have only to ask once more how much the steel industry has grown in recent years, or the automobile industry. Both have lost employment. Employment in blast furnaces, rolling mills and steelworks actually dropped from 611,000 workers in 1950 to 569,000 in 1960, for a decline of 42,000 workers.

What did this mean? It meant that unless unemployment was to grow, some other industry or commercial activity would have to pick up not only these 42,000 but another 104,000, if the new workers resulting from population growth were to be absorbed. The growth in population in the 10-year period was 18.4 percent.

The steel industry until 1959 was a considerable net exporter of steel. In the past 2 years the imported tonnage has exceeded exports by a considerable margin. Steel production in the remainder of the world has expanded much faster than in this country. Our share of world production has dropped to 26 percent from a level of 46 percent in the past 10 years.

Does this situation give much hope of the expansion of the steel industry to a point where it will no longer drop workers but add some from year to year?

The motor vehicle and equipment industry lost 44,000 workers in the same 10-year period. Yet it has to be said that this industry represented the very essence of mass production in this country. It, too, has moved from a net export position to a net import position.

It is also a common habit to say that only the smaller and less efficient industries need tariff protection. A report of the so-called Boggs subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, which held hearings on foreign economic policy in 1961 said:

These industries (i.e., those that are vulnerable to import competition) are not apt to prosper even if protected. There is, in fact, every evidence that they are stagnant or declining—the victims of changing fashions or technology, or of resource exhaustion. Even an increase of tariffs with respect to these industries would do nothing to arrest their decline.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a libel on many of our industries and shows a shocking lack of sympathy for our industries that are not only in the throes of technological change and shifts in consumer demand but also afflicted by import competition.

The diagnosis is false, as the difficulties of the automobile and steel industries illustrate. The implications of the attitude expressed are callous and totally without concern for the difficulties in which scores of our industries find themselves. The answer is then supposed to be greater efficiency.

This view is totally devoid of any sense or understanding of the problem. Increased efficiency, under some circumstances, as we have seen, will only compound the economic problem. Perhaps that is what the report wants to emphasize. The fact is that greater efficiency by itself will under certain conditions only represent the dog chasing its own tail. The greater the efficiency, so long as important competition is not only at the door but on the inside, the greater the displacement of workers without meeting the problem. Then more efficiency is called for because we need to export more in order to expand and grow; but this greater efficiency only throws yet more people out of work because imports capture any expanding

market that may result from a relative lowering of the cost of the product.

Mr. Speaker, all but a half dozen of our industries, such as aircraft, electronics, synthetics, et cetera, are facing a very difficult future, besieged as they are by sharp and growing import competition. It helps very little indeed for professors and report writers to sit on the sidelines and applaud import competition while belittling the efforts of our own industries to remain alive and accusing them of inefficiency, backwardness, and stagnation.

One would think there would be some comprehension of the struggle of these industries and compassion for them and their workers. One looks in vain for a spark of real concern over these tribulations. Oh, if they were foreign concerns and workers in a foreign country we would be running to them with basketsful of money and aid, no doubt; but since they are merely Americans and taxpayers there seems to be a readiness to take them for granted.

This is a strange attitude indeed. When we take into account the fact that it is the burdens placed on our producers by law that in great part has made it difficult to compete with imports, it becomes particularly difficult to understand those who have neither a kind word for, nor appreciation of, the great work of our industries. I do not say that these burdens are wrong; but they are a fact. No other country has minimum wages that are within shouting distance of ours. Hours of work are longer. Our tax laws are tougher in many respects. No one can doubt that our industries could compete handily if they paid wages as low as those that prevail abroad; yet no one suggests that we try this, and I, for one, would not be for it. It would be self-defeating.

Nevertheless, facts are facts and we do have higher costs of production and there is not much outside of displacing workers by machines that can be done about it. Yet if we resort to that we are faced with increasing unemployment. We should not be surprised at the movement of billions of dollars of our capital overseas under these circumstances. This, however, does not help the situation. In some respects it aggravates it.

What is needed is not a tariff bill that will only make matters worse, by exposing more industries to the bite of import competition or to a sharper bite if they are already exposed.

Exports are fine but they cannot begin to solve the unemployment problem, especially since they cannot be greatly increased without increasing competitive imports at the same time.

It would make much better sense to assure our industries of fair market competition through suitable tariffs and quotas, so that they could expand with confidence, knowing that their market would not be taken away by low-wage-based competition. With a brighter market outlook more industries would blossom rather than wither and employment would expand here rather than being shifted overseas.

Unless we do this our chronic unemployment will increase as the years go by and the professors will wonder why.

Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Georgia in his objection to H.R. 9900. I feel that we should provide the proper safeguards, which we do not have even now, rather than taking away what little there is.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, as the House moves closer to the debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 some Members find that they are being labeled "provincial" or "parochial" in their thinking about foreign trade merely because they are raising questions about provisions of the proposed act. Epithets will not deter the Members from doing their duty. There is not a Member of this body who does not take his responsibilities to his district, his State, and the Nation with the utmost seriousness. People who lose their tempers in the heat of debate often confuse fact and fancy. H.R. 9900 is an unprecedented measure. It goes far beyond anything the Congress has ever done before in the field of foreign trade policy. For this reason, if for no other, it behooves the Members to give it earnest attention. This House has a great and heavy responsibility and Members will not shirk it; but they are not going to be stampeded into action without long and careful consideration.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, Mr. Hickman Price, Jr., in a speech before the American Textile Machinery Association in Boston on February 27, told the textile industry that it has a 5-year umbrella protecting it against foreign imports and in that time it must become modern and efficient, prepared for the time when the Nation embarks upon an era of free trade. Members should take note of the last few words—an era of free trade. This Nation since it embarked on industrialization has never been guided by the policy of free trade. The United States cannot be charged with being a protectionist nation. Over the years this country has supported the doctrine of reciprocal trade and we have gone far in reducing our tariff schedules, often without receiving the reciprocity we thought we were entitled to receive in return. Now the Congress is asked to go further. We are asked to authorize the President to eliminate some tariffs altogether without knowing which tariffs will be eliminated, which industries are to be considered expendable, and how many workers will be thrown out of jobs, what the short- and long-range effects will be.

To raise such questions is not "provincial"; it is commonsense. In my area of the country we have a word for anyone who buys a "pig in a poke," and it is not "provincial," I assure you. There is nothing unique in a Member keeping the interests of his district foremost in his mind. President Kennedy did when a Member of this body and also when he was in the Senate. In "John Kennedy, a Political Profile" by James MacGregor Burns, it is reported that when the President was in Congress his "general position" was for liberalized trade policies, but "when it came to specific tariff problems, few Senators surpassed him in his zeal for guarding local interests." In 1949 when the President was a Member of the House, he voted against extension

of the Reciprocal Trade Act; but after the effort to kill the bill failed, Kennedy reversed himself and voted for final passage. In 1955, as a Senator, he voted to extend the Trade Act, but he vigorously opposed amendments which would have eliminated the peril point and escape clauses of the act. In 1958 he voted for extension but was most active in helping to establish laws that would help protect the Massachusetts fishing, textile, and watch industries. This is not said in criticism of the President; it is stated only as an example of how a Member of Congress looks out for the interests of his own district or his own State.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to know something of the genesis of this proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We know from the press that a task force under the chairmanship of the present Under Secretary of State, Mr. George W. Ball, made a recommendation to the President-elect on foreign trade policy. Our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRCHIN], recently sought to secure the full text of the report from Mr. Ball and was refused. Mr. Ball's refusal was based, in part, on the fact that he made the report as a private citizen to the President. Since the House apparently is not to have the opportunity to read the full text of the report, the Members are forced to rely on the press for an account of what the report recommends. One section of the report is interesting reading, and I call it to the attention of the Members. I quote from the New York Times of January 8, 1962:

A complete alteration of United States policy on trade with the Soviet bloc countries was recommended by the task force. It held this to be imperative not only because the present policy was outmoded but also because it had begun to affect our relations with other industrialized countries as well as with the under-developed areas. The problem will not go away because Americans consider trade with Communist countries to be immoral, dangerous, and of doubtful economic benefit, said the group. It said such trade would become vastly more important in this decade than in the last because other Western countries had found such trade to be advantageous. As a result, said the report, our allies have refused to follow docilely the tariff discriminations and export limitations on Communist trade imposed by U.S. law. Meanwhile, because the United States has refused to face the issue, trade between the Soviet bloc and Western Europe has been developing largely on Soviet terms, the group said. It said that the time has come for the United States to give direction to this inevitable development.

This is, in effect, a recommendation that the United States reverse its trade policy toward Russia and the Russian satellites.

Careful reading of H.R. 9900 allows for such a reversal, not directly but indirectly. Members should study that section of the proposed act that applies to the reduction or elimination of all duties on those commodities which the United States and the EEC nations combined export 80 percent of a given commodity. Members will find that the EEC countries are permitted to add to their share all the trade they conduct with the Soviet bloc and any goods they supply to Cuba to fill the gap due to the

United States embargo on trade with that unhappy island. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that this policy will meet with the approval of the majority of the Members.

The Ways and Means Committee will soon open hearings on H.R. 9900, and I am sure that the committee will probe deeply into all phases of the bill. There are, to me, some startling notions in the bill. Members interested in agriculture will be surprised at some of the proposals affecting agricultural commodities.

The bill also seems to be aimed at wrecking many small businesses in this country for the benefit of big business. Most big manufacturers are multiple producers; if there is no profit in one item or if there is a flood of imports which makes production of a given item unprofitable, the multiple producer can shift to another product. This is not true of the small manufacturer. Small business usually makes a single product or a few products in a limited area. The small producer cannot easily shift from one product to another. He seldom has the capital required for the necessary retooling, searching out of new markets, retraining his employees. If the small businessman is hit by unregulated imports, he is usually forced out of business. Most Members have seen this happen in their districts, and the prospects are that there will be more such casualties as a result of this proposed expansion of imports.

None of us is so naive that we do not know that an expansion of imports will follow an expansion of exports. H.R. 9900 has provisions for lending money to businesses that can prove their difficulties are the result of increased imports, but these provisions are inadequate; and judging from earlier experiences, it will be a tough job to prove that imports are the cause of a business shutdown. By the time such proof was compiled, the outlook is that the small businessman would already be out of business.

The peril point and escape clauses put into previous extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are further relaxed—in fact, relaxed to the point where it is doubtful if they will work at all. Past experience with these provisions which were voted as a method to prevent undue hardship due to excessive imports indicates they have not worked too well, and now it is proposed to strike them out for all practical purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires careful analysis and detailed answers must be given by the administration to the questions the Members will ask.

Mr. Speaker, I will now read the story from the New York Times from which I quoted a moment ago.

PRESIDENT IS TOLD TARIFF BARRIERS THREATEN WEST—LONG-SECRET REPORT WARNS OF ECONOMIC DISINTEGRATION WITHOUT 50-PERCENT REDUCTION

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 7.—If Congress refuses to authorize 50-percent cuts across the board in tariff rates, "disintegration of the free world economy into separate trading systems" may result, according to a long-secret task force report to President Kennedy on foreign economic policy.

The report says the resulting default in U.S. leadership in trade liberalization would have "political consequences of a most serious order." These, it said, would be in addition to "a formidable competitive disadvantage" to American exporters implicit in the growing European Common Market.

The report also proposed a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to nations of the bloc. It favored a new policy that would acknowledge the mutual advantages of expanding East-West trade and that would invite the Soviet Union to join in a "code of fair practices" for international trade.

BASIS OF PROGRAM

Although it was submitted to Mr. Kennedy as President-elect just before his inauguration, the report remains the basic rationale for the liberalized trade program he plans to ask Congress to approve at this session. The program would replace the expiring Trade Agreements Act.

The task force was headed by George W. Ball, who later became Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Other members of the group included college professors and private consultants, many now holding high administration posts.

Apparently reluctant to risk rejection of the new trade program during the first congressional session of his administration, the President did nothing, except in the field of foreign aid, about the report's many urgent and sweeping recommendations. Most of the aid proposals have since been carried out, but without adopting the scope of expenditures proposed.

Britain's decision to seek membership in the European Common Market and a continuation of the United States' balance-of-payments deficit last year, as well as the expiration of the trade agreements legislation next June, decided the President on an immediate course of action on the new program. The balance of payments is the measure of payments into and out of the country by individuals, business and governments.

The task force proposed Presidential authority to negotiate mutual trade concessions by cutting present tariff rates up to 50 percent. The cuts would be made in annual steps through 1966. The task force also proposed these further legislative authorizations:

"Assistance to labor and industry in adjusting to tariff reductions to replace the 'no serious injury' principle."

"Revision of the existing peril point provision so that it (A) is a device for determining what individual tariff rate adjustments should be made within a given category, and (B) goes into operation only after negotiations are completed on average reductions for each category." A peril point, determined by the Tariff Commission, is the level below which the tariffs cannot be cut without causing serious injury to domestic industry.

"Revision of escape clause standards (under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act) so that clause applies only when (A) injury occurs to an industry as a whole, and (B) adjustment to the increased imports cannot readily be made."

Trade adjustment assistance that would come into effect after a finding by the Tariff Commission of injury under the escape clause.

"Authority for the President to reduce or remove duties, import taxes and quotas on articles produced principally by the less developed countries."

"Authority to make or receive types of reciprocal concessions other than tariff reductions in trade negotiations."

"Revision of the national security provisions of trade agreements legislation to permit reduction of duties and an increase in quotas; use of measures other than tariffs to protect national security interests; relaxa-

tion of import restrictions, in concert with other members of the organization for economic cooperation and development, to accommodate trade with a country under Soviet economic pressure."

"Amendment of the Battle Act to safeguard normal trade against the disruptive practices of the Communist bloc."

"Authority for the President to suspend the embargo on furs and to suspend discriminatory tariff treatment for Soviet bloc imports."

CONCEPT MODIFIED

Because of the operation of a modified concept of existing peril point and escape clause provisions, the report recognized that it would be possible to make uniform 50-percent cuts in all negotiable categories of tariff rates.

For that reason it proposed that "the new legislation should provide authority to make greater than 50-percent reductions on certain items on which there is now a high level of tariff protection."

At the time the report was submitted, its authors considered it unlikely that Britain and the six other countries in the Free Trade Association would seek membership in the European Common Market. Britain's decision to do so presumably underscores the arguments for broad Presidential tariff powers.

"This tariff-cutting authority is necessary," said the report, "if we are to match the reductions to be made in the internal tariffs of the European Common Market and the Free Trade Association. In that way we could receive the benefits of the generalization of these reductions on a most-favored-nation basis." All nations having most-favored-nation provisions in agreements with the United States will get and receive concessions on a basis of equality with any other nation.

"Since those two trading groups will have reduced their tariffs by 50 percent across the board by 1966," the report said, "the United States, armed with the authority we propose, would be able to prevent divisions of the industrial countries of the free world by widespread trade discrimination."

As explained in the report, "the peril point mechanism serves as a limitation on the tariff-cutting authority of American negotiators in trade agreement negotiations." Under the Trade Agreements Act the President must explain to Congress any cuts below a peril point.

The escape clause mechanism, on the other hand, comes into play after tariffs have been reduced if the Tariff Commission determines that increased imports following a reduction cause serious injury.

"The task force is of the strong opinion that the no serious injury doctrine should be substantially abandoned," said the report. "The United States should recognize frankly that the liberalization of trade essential to a prosperous free world will require that tariffs be reduced to the point where it will be necessary to accept some temporary and local injury to certain American firms, industries, and communities."

To mitigate such possible hardships, the group proposed the inclusion of "trade adjustment provisions" in any authorizing legislation. But it suggested that this relief take the form of higher tariff rates only in extreme cases, such as when producers and workers in an industry are being displaced by competitive imports faster than they can be absorbed into alternative employment.

Such tariff relief could be applied by the President even where displaced workers were already receiving relief compensation, but it was recommended that such relief be of limited duration and progressively reduced.

FEDERAL LOANS BACKED

A trade adjustment program should rely in the main on Federal loans to finance in-

dustry relocation, accelerated tax writeoffs, and related procedures, the report said.

These would include retraining of workers, additional unemployment compensation, early retirement benefits and the like. Such benefits would be available without regard to whether or not the affected industries or workers are located in areas of substantial labor surplus.

The study group suggested that unilateral tariff concessions to underdeveloped areas be conditioned on parallel concessions to such areas by other industrialized countries. Such concessions could take the form of reduction or removal of consumption taxes or other restrictions on imports of tropical products, raw materials, or materials in the early stages of processing and certain light manufactures.

Such concessions would not only promote export earnings of underdeveloped areas, according to the report, but would tend to remove discriminations implicit in preferential trading systems maintained by Britain and the Common Market countries for their former overseas possessions.

To further the purpose of trade liberalization, the report urged abolition of the following provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930:

"The provision relating to cost-of-production criteria in fixing and raising of duties.

"The provisions requiring the use of American selling price in fixing the valuation of certain products.

"The provision directing customs officers to apply the highest rate of duty when alternatives exist."

COMMODITY PLAN SUGGESTED

Without committing itself to any particular method of approach, the task force said the time had come for the United States to consider ways of stabilizing the export income of underdeveloped areas producing a single raw material. Commodity stabilization agreements as well as loans to offset income fluctuation were suggested as worthy of exploration.

The report warned in this connection against "commodity agreement techniques that support prices at artificially high levels." It went on:

"The task force feels that much greater consideration should be given to the possibilities of using the resources of the International Monetary Fund for short-term loans to cushion income fluctuations resulting from cyclical variations in production conditions or on the terms of trade of raw material producing countries."

A complete alteration of U.S. policy on trade with Soviet bloc countries was recommended by the task force. It held this to be imperative not only because the present policy was outmoded and negative but also because it had begun to affect our relations with other industrialized countries as well as with the underdeveloped areas.

The problem will not go away because Americans consider trade with Communist countries to be "immoral, dangerous and of doubtful economic benefit," said the group. It said such trade would become vastly more important in this decade than in the last because other Western countries had found such trade to be advantageous.

"As a result," said the report, "our allies have refused to follow docilely the tariff discriminations and export limitations on Communist trade imposed by U.S. law."

EUROPEAN TRADE CITED

Meanwhile, because the United States has refused to face the issue, trade between the Soviet bloc and Western Europe has been developing largely on Soviet terms, the group said. It said the time had come for the United States to give direction to this inevitable development.

It called for "a positive response to Khrushchev's high-sounding trade overtures" and said "the Soviet should be invited to trade with free world countries on the

basis of a code of fair practices designed to remove the distortion and disruptions arising from monopolistic state commerce."

"The code should serve as a model for industrialized and underdeveloped countries in the negotiation of bilateral treaties or multilateral trade arrangements with the bloc," said the report.

"For example, detailed ground rules, coupled with an effective complaint procedure, would seek to regulate disruptive price undercutting and dumping by reference to comparative world price and cost criteria, rather than to the totally unrelated and unascertainable conditions prevalent in the Communist home market; to provide meaningful reciprocity in conditions governing access to Communist markets; to obtain Soviet commitments to purchase specified quotas of goods in lieu of an otherwise futile most-favored-nation treatment undertaking; to end the wholesale pirating of Western patents, know-how, and technology; and, in general, to insure that trade and competition are conducted on the basis of commercial considerations."

SEES ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

The report reasoned that "failing East-West agreement, the United States and its industrialized allies would still possess the economic advantage needed to secure observance of the rules, assuming that a uniform and coordinated policy toward Soviet bloc trade is established through consultation with OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) and the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade)."

The report observed that present voluntary machinery for controlling strategic export to the Soviet bloc from North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries and Japan had all but broken down. Much more than a desire for profits among Western European countries had been responsible for this, it said.

"The Soviet Union's demonstrated technological capacity to wage a nuclear war has led most Western countries to reject the proposition that the bloc's military potential can be affected by the type of export controls maintained by the United States."

Notwithstanding this consideration, the report proposed that any future trade with Communist China and Cuba should be determined by political rather than commercial factors. It should be permitted, prohibited, or banned, said the group, depending on what policy moves were contemplated by the United States in those areas.

On the general question of East-West trade the report continued:

"To blunt the dangers and exploit the opportunities inherent in the bloc's expanding economic commitments, we must persuade other free enterprise countries to take constructive and coordinated action.

"What is needed first of all is some measure of conviction on their part that we are genuinely prepared to recognize the potential economic advantages of expanded East-West trade.

"Only then will we be in a position to assert positive leadership in the formulation and enforcement of safeguards necessary for the protection of the common interest in stable world trade."

The group proposed "as a step in establishing a constructive policy image," that the United States should confine export control act prohibitions "to exceptional producers likely to contribute to the Soviet military potential in an important, direct, and immediate way."

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there are times when it is necessary to get down to earth on the big overriding international problems. This is one of those times. I think we have to start untangling the propaganda and the

oversimplifications that we see today in support of H.R. 9900, the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The first point I would like to mention is the title of the bill. I am afraid that Trade Expansion Act of 1962 may be a masterpiece of deception.

One of the great concerns of this administration and of the country is the rate of growth of the national economy. I am sure that the Members of the House and all Americans share that concern. We are most interested in the reports that other countries, especially Western Europe, are demonstrating greater economic growth than the United States. We know steps must be taken to address ourselves to the entire issue. This will not be done by the supporters of H.R. 9900 holding up that bill as the answer to the problem. Nor is public understanding helped by the campaign of jibes at opponents of H.R. 9900 in the press.

The image of the so-called protectionists by our political cartoonists today shows opponents of H.R. 9900 as greedy, fat cats luxuriating atop towering tariff walls that bar the entry of foreign products and victimize the American consumer. I happen to represent an area in Ohio that has suffered seriously from the effects of import competition for many years. I have never seen a "fat cat" in my district. I have known many lean ones who are out of business today because foreign products have come over the low tariff walls that still exist.

Frankly, I am glad that this discussion has occurred today and that Members are stating their sincere convictions that H.R. 9900 may actually retard the Nation's economic growth. It is admitted by those favoring the bill that industries and employees will be "displaced" by this legislation. "Displaced" is a polite word for unemployed. So the bill provides for retraining and relocation of those forced out of employment as a result of further tariff cuts. But, these are palliatives and nothing more. Let us take a hard look at this problem.

In fact, the industries to be hurt are those that the State Department considers inefficient. These will be industries that find they cannot compete with low foreign wage rates, foreign government subsidies for exports, and lack of statutory rules abroad on hours of work and working conditions.

By following the administration's lead on this issue, we may, inadvertently, not only slow down the economic growth of this country. We would most likely create hard-core unemployment problems that would make those we have now seem simple by comparison.

Some workers forced out of their jobs through the elimination of today's tariffs may be eligible for retraining. They may be willing and able to leave their homes for retraining and new jobs. But, how about the worker who has his roots in his hometown. He has a family, he has a substantial equity in his home, his children are attached to the community, there are family ties. This man is reluctant to pull up stakes and try his luck in a new job for which he has only minimum training and, perhaps, ability.

Those of us who represent the chronically distressed areas are familiar with this problem. We must realize the limitations of any such program. Only last week, we passed manpower retraining legislation. The bill had overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle. But few of us believed that it was more than a partial answer to the structural unemployment problem we have already. I think it was important legislation but there will be many unemployed persons who will not be eligible for these retraining programs. Some will be too old. Others will lack sufficient education or adaptability for training. Still others will hope that things will get better and they can get their old jobs back. Many employers are unwilling to hire older workers because the insurance and pension costs rise with the age of the worker. What is the unemployed worker of 40-plus to do? Hang on until he is 62 to collect a minimum old-age pension? There is a serious relationship of this and many other such problems to H.R. 9900. We wish it were not so, but the facts are there for anyone who will look. I feel that for years our trade policies have been motivated more by wishful thinking, academic theorizing, and plain fantasy than they have by facts and reality.

Let us take the issue of wages as a factor in rising imports. In the Orient, wages average less than 30 cents an hour, including fringe benefits. The average in Western Europe is about \$1 also including fringes. In the United States, the average wage is \$2.36 an hour, excluding fringe benefits. We have statutory laws on minimum wages and maximum hours. The workweek in the Orient is 54 to 60 hours. In Western Europe it runs from 48 to 54 hours. It takes no economic genius to understand the advantage this gives producers in the Orient and Western Europe over United States in wage costs alone. We have somewhat halfheartedly dealt with parts of the problem this creates and we have rather grotesque results.

Consider the two-price system in raw cotton. The textile industry abroad can buy U.S. cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper than our domestic textile industry can buy the same cotton. We know this issue is before the Tariff Commission now, but the prospects are that it will be months before the Commission completes its study. In the meantime, this additional advantage stands. Foreign nations are actually subsidizing exporters through tax benefits. It seems that, except for cotton farmers, the United States works in the opposite direction.

We hear a great deal about U.S. producers needing to modernize their plants and put themselves in a stronger competitive position in the domestic and world markets. Modernizing would be more possible if our Government were not so busy penalizing initiative with punitive tax rates. So long as Washington needs such a big bite out of every productive dollar to pay for the management of the lives of the American people, lecturing industry about expansion while

the means are drained off is doubletalk. Competition we want, but the rules of the game need to be even.

The foreign aid program has seen to it that our industrial competitors in Japan and Western Europe have obtained the most efficient machinery available. After making the machinery available via foreign aid, our Government has sent skilled technicians abroad to teach plant managers and workers how to use the equipment. American merchandising and advertising techniques were included in the training. We have also contributed to the opening of markets for our former enemies. This was surely a manifestation of the good will of the United States and we need not apologize for it. The job has been done well. But this is no reason why we should continue to allow such an outpouring of generosity to come back to haunt us now.

Due to the prodding of the President, an international agreement on cotton textile imports has been negotiated. There are some serious reservations in some quarters about that 5-year pact. However, the fact remains that this administration found it useful, and perhaps even imperative, to seek such an agreement. I think it is regrettable that other manmade fibers such as wool were not included in the agreement. I understand that this was at the behest of the State Department. If the administration found that the best way to handle cotton textile imports was through an international agreement, then it seems to me that it is fair to ask why other commodities could not be handled the same way.

Basically, the international cotton textile agreement is a form of quota system designed, within the limits of the pact, to protect the U.S. industry and jobs. If this method is good for cotton textile imports, why should it not apply to other industries in the same predicament? Is this a bid to quiet the concern about imports in textile-producing areas and, thereby, win support for H.R. 9900? Looking at this situation on the basis of the pragmatic politics that this administration knows so well, is this the minimum price the President has to pay to pick up support for his program?

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled, and so are other Members I have talked with, at the pressure spokesmen for H.R. 9900 are applying to various groups to win support for this legislation. If this proposal is so good for the country, then it should be able to stand on its own merits. Special meetings with segments of certain industries, urging them to whip other members of their industries into line, should not be necessary.

This legislation is certainly not self-recommending. It deserves careful study and we need to expose to public view the boobytraps that it contains. I urge that every Member here weigh this legislation carefully in terms of the national interest and their own districts.

I include as part of my remarks an article from the Wall Street Journal of February 14, pertaining to the campaign to push H.R. 9900 through Congress.

TARIFF TUSSE: WHITE HOUSE, FEARING BITTER BATTLE, STEPS UP CAMPAIGN TO WIN CUTS—IT ADDS LOBBYISTS, PR MEN, PREPARES TO USE PRESSURE ON RELUCTANT LAWMAKERS—SPECIAL KENNEDY TV APPEAL?

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's legislative strategists are calling out the reserves in their battle for sweeping new powers to cut U.S. tariffs.

Extra public relations men and lobbyists are being mobilized at the White House. Regional selling "seminars" are being organized by friendly Governors. The President himself may take to the air with a special televised appeal. And juicy bait is being dangled before possible holdouts against the administration's wishes.

These are just a few of the steps being taken or contemplated by the Kennedy regime in the top-priority fight for freer trade. The President's request to Congress for new tariff-cutting powers has the avowed aim of meeting the trade challenge raised by Europe's expanding Common Market and of knitting the non-Communist world into a tighter economic grouping. The Common Market countries are eliminating tariffs among themselves and erecting a common tariff wall against imports from other nations; the President wants to swap U.S. tariff cuts for similar concessions from the Common Market so U.S. exporters will have continued access to the European member countries.

White House insiders concede the fight will be tough and bitter, with strong, vocal protectionist sentiment coming from every State and almost every congressional district. But officials insist the President and every member of his team are just as deeply committed to winning this battle.

WOOLING RELUCTANT LAWMAKERS

One key operation in the administration campaign got started yesterday, as part of a special effort to win over a crucial bloc of reluctant lawmakers from southern and north-eastern textile manufacturing areas. The Tariff Commission began hearings on a Presidential request to study the need for a higher tariff on cotton textile imports, to eliminate the competitive advantage that foreign producers gain through buying American-grown raw fiber cheaper than U.S. manufacturers can; price props keep cotton prices high in the United States while subsidies enable it to be sold for less in export markets. It's true that doubts have lately sprouted about the President's willingness to approve a textile tariff boost. But if this particular brand of relief does not finally materialize, some other form of help may well be granted to textile makers.

Even among friends of the general freer trade goal, there are worriers and doubters, to be sure. "The administration's public relations men are falling all over each other," says one trade bill backer outside the Government. "They may work together sometimes, but it seems unlikely." A free-trading Democratic Senator declares: "The White House talks endlessly about the bill but has never bothered to take a complete nose-count of votes in Congress. It's fantastic." Says a Democratic Congressman friendly to the President's plan: "I've seen plans for big White House selling efforts before, and they never materialize. I'm afraid this may peter out the same way."

But the administration side does appear better unified than the opposition forces. So far, at least, the protectionists have spoken mostly in individual voices representing single industries or areas. Anyway, White House men in charge of the trade fight insist their machine will be rolling smoothly by the time the House Ways and Means Committee starts hearings on the is-

sue early next month, and will be in high gear by the time the House itself votes, probably sometime in May.

"FAR AHEAD OF 1958 EFFORT"

"We're already far ahead of the 1958 effort at the comparable time," claims a veteran free-trade advocate recalling the last congressional action on Presidential tariff-cutting requests. "And in another month, we'll be far ahead of any effort ever made before for a trade bill."

The administration has not, to be sure, worked out detailed legislative tactics for piloting its trade plan past congressional shoals. But the first objective is to get the best possible bill out of the Ways and Means Committee; Kennedy aids fear Chairman MILLIS, who's sometimes said to follow a policy of anticipatory surrender, may compromise more than necessary to win protectionist votes. Then it's hoped to build this measure through the House itself pretty much as is, and to limit expected toning down in the Senate as far as possible.

In large part, the administration is approaching congressional opinion by way of public opinion. President Kennedy, who has already plugged his trade plan at press conferences and in major speeches, will personally make several more attempts to build public support. One or more already accepted Presidential speaking engagements will probably be converted into trade-selling attempts. Under study is a Presidential TV program devoted to the trade problem, complete with maps and charts. At the President's suggestion aids are preparing, for wide public distribution on trade policy—and the answers.

Mr. Kennedy also is prepared, aids vow, to use every pressure device available—promises, rewards, threats, arm twisting—to line up individual Congressmen for the trade bill. On the receiving end may be Members of the protection-minded oil and metal-mining blocs in Congress, as well as some lawmakers from textile-producing areas. It's considered possible that somewhat tighter oil import curbs may be announced shortly before voting time in the House. If western mining-State lawmakers appear to hold the balance of power on the trade issue, officials hint, some help could be extended to the troubled lead and zinc industries.

To keep the State Department, so suspect to many conservative lawmakers, in the background, the President has assigned command of the trade battle to a special White House staff section headed by Philadelphia banker Howard Petersen. And Mr. Petersen's staff is undergoing a major buildup at the moment. Two men on loan from private industry—Carl Levin of Schenley Industries and John Hoving of the Air Transport Association—head a public relations group that ultimately will have six or seven full-time and part-time operatives loaned by business organizations and Government agencies. They work closely with an interdepartmental public relations committee headed by Assistant Commerce Secretary William Ruder.

To head a "legislative liaison" or lobbying section in Mr. Petersen's shop, the White House has borrowed the administrative assistant of Democratic Senator Monroney of Oklahoma, Thomas D. Finney, Jr. He's in the process of recruiting one or two aids from outside Washington, and will work closely with the regular White House lobbying team headed by Presidential Assistant Lawrence O'Brien. Lobbyists from other agencies will help, of course.

From the top down, Mr. Kennedy's teammates are doing their part in the sales drive. Vice President JOHNSON plugs the trade plan in almost every speech he makes. Special Presidential Assistant Brooks Hays, former Democratic Congressman from Arkansas, is practically a full-time trade evangelist, speaking particularly in textile-oriented southern areas.

CABINET MEN LINE UP SUPPORT

Individual Cabinet members are lining up support among their special "clients." Labor Secretary Goldberg endeavors to minimize union worries over mounting imports and to get union lobbyists working for the trade bill. Agriculture Secretary Freeman urges farm organizations to remind farm State lawmakers of the importance of export markets for American agricultural commodities. Commerce Secretary Hodges attempts to get businessmen in line.

The administration has also been staging special trade policy briefings in Washington for friendly groups of business, labor, farm, and civic leaders. Late last month, leaders of about 100 such groups from all parts of the Nation got an all-day sales pitch at the State Department from top administration experts. The Department is making available to Congressmen and interested private organizations two pamphlets on the trade issue: a 61-page effort entitled "Together We Are Strong," and a 33-page brochure on "The A B C's of Foreign Trade."

When congressional hearings open next month, the administration will wheel out its big guns almost en masse. At least seven Cabinet members will testify: Secretary of State Rusk, Treasury Secretary Dillon, Defense Secretary McNamara, and Interior Secretary Udall as well as Messrs. Goldberg, Freeman, and Hodges. Some are already "testifying" in private conversations with lawmakers. Thus Mr. Hodges, a former Governor of North Carolina, recently ran through the administration's case with his State's congressional delegation.

To help clinch the argument for doubtful legislators, the Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior Departments are working to have ready in about 2 weeks detailed figures showing the amount of exports from each congressional district. Compared with similar figures produced in the 1955 and 1958 trade law fights, "these will be far more detailed and useful," an administration official promises. In the next few weeks, teams of Commerce and State Department officials will begin followup talks that eventually, it's hoped, will drive the administration arguments home to each Member of Congress personally.

To mobilize local support for its trade program, the administration is counting on considerable outside help. Democratic Gov. Matthew Welsh of Indiana has invited some 400 businessmen, farm leaders, union officials, newspaper editors, and broadcasters to Indianapolis March 6 and 7. Federal, State, and industry officials will discuss the Hoosier stake in foreign trade. Democratic Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois has set up a similar meeting in Chicago late this month and hopes to have a half dozen later sessions in different parts of the State.

Governors Welsh and Kerner also are planning to cohost a Midwest Governors' Conference on Export Expansion; they hope to enlist the support of Governors Nelson of Wisconsin, Swainson of Michigan, Andersen of Minnesota, and possibly others, and bring opinion-leaders from all these States to Chicago in late March or April to hear Government and industry officials preach the tariff-cutting gospel. Similar sessions are being considered in several other States.

To ease the task of building public support, the administration is seeking bipartisan backing. Mr. Petersen himself is a prominent Republican. Former Presidents Eisenhower and Hoover have endorsed the Kennedy trade approach in general terms; former Vice President Nixon, New York Governor Rockefeller, former Secretary of State Herter, 1960 Vice Presidential Candidate Henry Cabot Lodge, one time Presidential Candidate Alfred Landon and other Republicans are looked to for possible testimony on behalf of the Kennedy trade bill.

The major private propaganda push for the bill will come from the Committee for

a National Trade Policy, a predominantly business organization headed by Gillette Co. Chairman Carl Gilbert. In addition, regional business groups, such as the World Trade Center of New England, will run "seminars" at which administration officials will speak, publicize the export trade figures worked up by the administration, seek support from local newspapers and broadcasters, and otherwise influence Members of Congress. The officials will use the trade figures to support their argument that U.S. industry would be helped more by increasing exports than by curbing import competition.

The outcome of the trade fight may largely hinge on the administration's success in winning over lawmakers from areas complaining of import injury. The surest bet, however distasteful to the Kennedy regime, appears to lie in extra protection for their industries.

WANTED: "LITTLE SWEETENING"

"Most of the Congressmen with oil in their districts also have many other industries," one Texas Democrat observes, "and they'll manage to go along with the administration if they get just a little sweetening."

"We have made overture after overture," complains a Democratic Senator from a western mining State, "asking that the administration give us just a little something so that we can go along on the trade bill. But there's no sign of anything yet."

The most ambitious administration efforts are aimed at winning textile votes. Lawmakers from southern textile areas began swinging against free trade in 1955; now Kennedy strategists figure added assistance for the industry might pick up 15 to 25 votes in the closely divided House.

Last May the administration announced a seven-point program to help domestic textile manufacturers. Some of the promised steps already have been taken: Liberalized tax depreciation allowances on textile machinery; a 1-year agreement, that took effect last October, under which Far Eastern suppliers had to hold down cotton textile shipments to this country under threat of unilaterally imposed U.S. quotas; a 5-year agreement, just negotiated in Geneva and still not made public, along similar import-curbing lines.

Even more could hang, though, on congressional reaction to administration promises of some relief for U.S. textile makers from their cotton-cost disadvantage. This might be accomplished through some sort of reduction in cotton price supports if not through the Tariff Commission proceedings just begun.

Textile Congressmen, however, are arguing they want to see the actual Tariff Commission recommendations before they give the administration their votes on the trade bill. "We've accepted promises before," says one southern Senator, "and then the State Department finds a loophole. This time we want action first."

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Georgia for his very timely discussion of our trade policy. I include in the RECORD at this point, an exceptionally splendid speech by Hon. A. Lee Parsons, formerly with the Banking Committee of the U.S. Senate, on the subject of trade. I commend this speech to the attention of every single Member of the House and Senate before we write any new trade legislation.

A. LEE PARSONS, DIRECTOR, NEW YORK OFFICE, AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE BEFORE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, BROOKLYN HEIGHTS BRANCH, MARCH 7, 1962

In order to cast my comments in a realistic setting let me, at the outset, assure you of a very practical interest in a revitalization

of international trade policy; practical as opposed to academic or economic theory. My principals are businessmen who represent billions of dollars of capital investment. They buy the bulk of their raw materials in a Government-controlled market and sell in the toughest—and yet the most sensitive—market in the world. They supply one of the three most essential needs of mankind. They represent a major section of the domestic economy and their goods and services are absolutely basic to our Nation's defense effort—second only to steel. They pay an enormous tax bill and in hundreds of localities in this country are the major or even sole support of the community. Because of the very nature of the industry, it represents the last stronghold of a pure, free enterprise system.

The giant complex of the textile industry employs more than 2 million Americans. Simply stated, that figure means that one of every eight manufacturing employees in the United States works in the textile industry. For these, and many other, reasons we approach the subject of trade from a very practical standpoint. It is as practical to these more than 2 million people as the source of tomorrow's bread. It is a source of concern to 15 million people who derive income, either directly or indirectly, from this industry.

To bring it a little closer home look at the economic importance of textile to New York. If the industry were removed, for one reason or another, acceptable economic yardsticks indicate that 3½ million people would lose their current source of income.

Yes, to us, the subject of trade, and its importance to our industry, is not academic. It is not economic theory. It is a hard-nosed fact of survival. And survival does not mean status quo stagnation. It means progress through product and market research. It means growth.

You ask a fair question: "How should the United States revitalize its trade policy?" You deserve, and you shall have, a fair answer. We shall have a revitalized, flexible, and responsible trade policy when the basic trade legislation reflects these points:

1. The maintenance of a growing American economy and expanding job opportunities for Americans.
2. Safeguards of American industrial and military strength as keystones to the defense security of this Nation and of the free world.
3. Encouragement of the orderly expansion of world trade to achieve rational economic growth and rising standards of living in emerging nations, and to foster continued growth in the economies of advanced nations without growth impairment or distortions from excessive concentration of imports in specific sectors of their economies.
4. The quest of a realistic balance between concern for the industrial development of other nations and the continued economic growth of this Nation, avoiding the extremes of free trade and economic isolationism. World trade objectives are self-defeating when pursued at the expense of the U.S. economy or of specific American industries.
5. A requirement that trade concessions granted by the United States be reciprocated truly by other nations.
6. Provide for the administration of our trade policy in such a way as to prevent the depletion of U.S. gold reserves, and preserve the prestige of the U.S. dollar throughout the world.
7. Provide for the distribution of the burden of imports as equitably as possible throughout the American economy, avoiding concentrations of imports on segments of the economy in such quantity as to curtail domestic industrial expansion and force U.S. capital abroad with the resultant loss of American job opportunities and revenue.
8. Provide, within the framework of an orderly trade program, efficient machinery for the control of excessive imports as such con-

trols become necessary to achieve the above-stated objectives.

In the preface of your book "The Politics of Trade" your President took note of these points after committing you "to support liberal trade and world economic development." Let us see what happens when you translate this theory into one-sided trade agreements.

Between 1934 and 1945 import duties of the United States were reduced 50 percent. In 1945 another 50-percent reduction was authorized. In 1955 and again in 1958 the Congress authorized the President to negotiate additional reduction of 15 and 20 percent respectively. These authorizations total a neat 82-percent reduction in U.S. duties since the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act. Of that amount, the average of cuts probably exceed 60 percent. Many categories of goods have been bargained away at a rate of 75 percent and even higher.

These concessions in duties have been made, on a multilateral, most-favored nation basis, by teams of negotiators representing you and me; management, labor, and consumer. The bargaining sessions have been conducted in the much-maligned name of reciprocity. So let's have a look at the magnanimity of the reciprocal concessions from the benefactors of our good will and generosity.

In 1956, despite the announcement of our State Department that only negligible cuts had been made in a few carefully selected textile products, we found, in fact, that the entire broad range of the industry's product had been pared and that the very bread-and-butter items of the industry had been reduced up to 50 percent. Knowing that these concessions were made bilaterally to Japan, and of course extended to all other parties to GATT, we looked to see what munificent reciprocal concessions our negotiators had wrested from the Japanese team. These were the offerings in exchange for the heart of an industry:

- (1) Raw cotton could enter Japan duty free.
- (2) Milk donated for school lunches by the United States could enter duty free.
- (3) Olive oil for canned sardines, for re-export, could enter duty free.
- (4) Japan would not build any four-engine airplanes.

But what of the other nations and their reaction to our good faith concessions to the stimulation of international trade?

Fifty-two countries have raised insurmountable barriers against imports of American textiles. Many of these countries are prime suppliers of textiles to the United States and are among the largest recipients of our aid programs.

Twenty-two countries impose substantial restrictions on our textiles and, accordingly, our shipments to them are diminishing to nothing.

Now it is our turn, in all fairness, to ask: "What barriers would you remove?" Look, for a moment, at this rather average example.

A fully equipped standard size Ford costs \$6,917 in France. A typical American compact costs \$4,785 in France; more than twice its price in the United States. A typical small French car costs \$1,200 in France. Calculate the optimum, drastic reduction in French duty and surcharges and you will find the price of the American car still well above that of the French car. So, the American automobile manufacturer will build his cars in France, turn his product in the French market at a nice profit, enjoy the extraordinary tax advantages on a foreign investment, contribute further to a labor shortage in France and add to the unemployment relief doles in Detroit.

This will increase the tax moneys expenditures of the welfare agencies, reduce the sales to one of the domestic textile industry's best customers and cut off wages needed for the purchase of clothes, cameras, transistor

radios, and all the other consumer items the foreign manufacturers are now pouring into this market.

Let's you forget, we are talking about revitalizing our trade policies and I am suggesting that the further reduction of our duties on imports has no bearing whatsoever on the subject. We need negotiators who can induce other countries to reduce or remove their barriers against trade.

Any textile manufacturer in the world can buy American cotton at a price 8½ cents per pound under the cost to an American mill, transport it to a foreign country, spin and weave it into a common, unfinished piece of cloth, ship it back to the United States, pay transportation and duties, and sell it at a profit, at a price below the cost of manufacture in an efficient American mill. Don't tell us that our tariffs are a hindrance to foreign trade.

American textile manufacturers give no quarter to any industry in patriotism or competitiveness. In 1948 we were instrumental in the establishment of a \$100 million revolving fund for the use of the Japanese cotton textile industry. We supported other aid measures and contributed technical and management services to help rebuild war-torn industries. Our financial aid and technical know-how helped build textile mills in countries with pressing needs for cloth for the backs of their naked people.

But what happened? The backs are either still naked or are partially covered with the imported product of other low-wage producers and the products of their own mills are being exported to the United States and Canada.

Look at the record. Traditionally an exporter of textiles, the United States has been, since 1958, a net importer of textile manufactures. Principal exporters to the United States of countable cotton cloth, in order of their importance, are Japan, Hong Kong, France, Formosa, India, Portugal, Pakistan, Spain, West Germany, and Korea. With the exception of Hong Kong, which is a free port, and France, which has recently liberalized some of its restrictions (West Germany to a lesser extent), all of these countries have virtually embargoed imports of American cotton goods through the manipulation of intricate controls.

India imposes a 65-percent ad valorem duty on cottons and 100 percent on synthetics. Pakistan imposes a 100-percent duty on cottons and 250 percent on synthetics. Even with these exorbitant tariff restrictions, a license is necessary—and impossible for an American exporter to obtain.

This leads me to take a few moments of this time which is all too short for this subject to mention the fallacious figures concerning balance of trade with which the public is being propagandized.

The Congress and the American public are being asked to believe that the United States sells approximately \$5 billion more in exports than it pays for imports. The mildest characterization of this claim is to brand it a myth.

Innumerable news stories, articles, pamphlets, radio and TV broadcasts and speeches repeat and repeat such claims as the following excerpt from an "official" speech: "Last year we sold to other countries almost \$20 billion worth of American goods" while "our purchases from abroad were in the order of \$15 billion." The emphasis is always on "we sold" or "we sell" and "our purchases."

The fact is that we do not sell exports amounting to \$5 billion more than we pay for imports. We do not receive \$20 billion for the American goods we export, although we undoubtedly pay \$15 billion for the foreign goods we import.

The public are being misled to believe that the figures cited by the propagandists relate to commercial transactions in international trade.

The total of \$5 billion of "export sales" over import purchases is attained only by the fantastic and fictitious method of counting gifts as "sales."

We export the goods. We just don't get the dollars.

Although Government statistical reports on exports, imports, foreign aid, subsidized "sales" and other pertinent factors are not specifically designed to reveal the facts which rebut the myth of the \$5 billion export trade surplus, the true facts can be gleaned from such statistics and the result is startling. Even allowing for a margin of error, the basic fact remains that in terms of international trade, in commercial transactions, we have not even approached any such \$5 billion export trade surplus.

It is possible to identify shipments of goods under various programs of grants or foreign aid credits amounting to about \$2 billion. Other so-called "sales"—credits, loans or other forms of subsidy—amount to another \$1½ billion. (This would include the "sale" of raw cotton at a \$42.50 per bale discount.) In fact, it is easy to determine that commercial transactions in international trade account for a trade balance of less than 30 percent of the mythical \$5 billion export trade surplus.

It becomes fairly obvious that in dealing with countries receiving this kind of treatment such has been accorded Yugoslavia, India, Poland and many others, the United States does not need to reduce duties on imports in order to induce these nations to continue to accept gifts of exports from the United States.

So it is that both you and we advocate a revitalization of our trade policies. From that point we begin to differ. You attack the problem, we often suppose, from the Utopian precept that a beautiful theory of free trade can be spread like the gossamer wings of Queen Mab's fairy midwife. We on the other hand, trade—buy and sell—under the conditions which actually exist in the world market.

Any proposals leading to drastic changes in our foreign trade policy should be subjected to searching analysis. The very existence of the conditions on which we have touched cautions against becoming engulfed in a tide of emotional slogans. In no other country on this globe is there any manifest desire to adopt free trade policies or even reduce any restrictions except ours.

We must continue to deal with the world as it is, knowing full well that even our closest allies are governed by what they consider to be their best interests. Any other course could well lead to economic chaos.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the so-called adjustment assistance proposal contained in the tariff bill, H.R. 9900.

I believe that this is one of the worst features of the bill, and there are several bad features.

It seems like a very strange procedure to go about creating unemployment and business failure as a conscious act and then setting up first-aid stations and clinics to undo the damage.

The question arises, Why should we grant to imports the right of eminent domain in the first place? Why indeed should we place imports on such a high pedestal that domestic industries, often the backbone of local communities and the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of workers, must make way for them? What is the great virtue of imports that they should be entitled to such treatment?

Of course, the answer is that without imports we cannot expect to export. Therefore what we really seek is en-

larged exports. The question then is what are the great virtues of exports that we should sacrifice domestic industries in order to gain greater exports?

Surely there is no particular virtue in exports that cannot be found also in production for the domestic market. Why should we destroy employment in some industries through creation of greater import competition for the sake of gaining employment in other industries? Not only does this represent favoritism and discrimination but the effects, on balance, are of most doubtful benefit and more probably negative and harmful.

Before we jump into this new sharp departure offered by H.R. 9900 we would do well to do a little exploring to find out where we are and where we would be headed if the bill were to pass.

One of the compelling considerations behind the bill is the problem of unemployment. At least it is in the name of economic improvement, including greater employment, that the legislation is offered and so strenuously and inordinately propagated in official statements.

One becomes outright suspicious when a bill must have behind it all the massed artillery, missiles and warheads from the executive arsenal such as has been massed behind this one. I do not recall anything like it. Evidently it needs a lot of defense and a lot of force to move it along. I wonder why? Does it have so little merit that it cannot make its way in any other manner? Evidently the bill's content does not naturally recommend it.

I have mentioned the adjustment assistance provision of the bill. It is said that labor is for the bill principally because it has this provision; and that if it did not have it, labor would be against it.

It is not quite right to say that labor is for this provision. Let me quote from several national union presidents who spoke in the AFL-CIO convention in Miami last December when a resolution on the trade agreements program was being debated.

E. L. Wheatley, president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Pottery, said:

You can talk of giving money to distressed people and train them into new industries. We do not think that program will get there in time to do any good in the way of offering relief to our people.

George Fecteau, president of the United Shoe Workers of America, was somewhat more emphatic. He said:

As one who has been in the field and has seen factory after factory go down, and has seen the efforts of our union and these workers to place themselves in industry, I know that such talk is a lot of damned foolishness. It is not practicable or just.

William Pollock, president of the Textile Workers of America, also had something to say:

When you get an individual that has spent 20 or 30 years learning a skill . . . only to find his job shipped to some other nation and he is to be trained to go, maybe, into the electronics industry, where they are barely paying a minimum wage, it is pretty hard to convince him that this is a sacrifice he must make in the interest of world peace.

These were expressions from the heads of unions where membership would be most likely to become eligible for "adjustment assistance" and they did not take kindly to it. Oh, the unions that are in services or trades not directly hit by imports might think the retraining and relocation features of the bill would be acceptable; but they are not the ones involved and have had no experience with displacement by imports.

Those who are in the direct line of fire are not favorably impressed, as these quotations show. Why, after all, should a worker in the pottery, glass, shoe, or textile industry be asked to lose his job and go onto the ash heap for retraining and possibly relocation, so that someone working in another industry could hold on to his job or so that another industry could hire someone else while the shoe or textile or pottery or glass worker made way for imports?

In the first place, the shoe, pottery, or glass worker who already has a job is working at it. If imports take the job away from him how can anyone be sure that someone somewhere else, probably in another State, will in fact hire him? This would require quite an act of faith. We may be sure that the company in which the worker was employed would not rehire him if he lost his job to imports. In fact, he would be one of a number who were displaced and there would no longer be a spot for him. It is not likely that another pottery, textile, or glass plant would pick him up unless they let someone else go, because these other plants would also be under pressure from imports. Under these circumstances there would be no new plants opened or additions made to existing ones. The displaced worker then must go elsewhere.

The question is, Where would he go and what skill would he offer? He would find his past skill out of place and he would either need retraining or would have to go to work as an unskilled worker. This would greatly reduce his pay and would be an economic waste. It would also damage his self-respect.

The whole theory on which the adjustment assistance proposal is based takes it for granted that new jobs can be found. That this is a doubtful assumption becomes clear when we think of the distress areas that are already in existence and how difficult it has been to solve that problem. The areas surrounding those in which employment is down seldom have a demand for workers beyond those currently employed. Therefore it would be necessary to find a labor-shortage area. These, to say the least, are not plentiful. In fact, we would be hard put to it to mention one, not to mention a dozen or two.

Labor shortage areas do not usually last very long. They go hand in hand with some local boom or a general boom that affects some particular areas with more activity than others. By the time the displaced workers were retrained any labor shortage that had existed might be gone.

The general effect of retraining would be to create dependence on the Government. Perhaps the Government would soon be in a position of having to find

the necessary jobs or having to create them and thus causing chronic dependence.

These difficulties would also apply to adjustment assistance extended to manufacturers. According to H.R. 9900 these would first have to suffer "prolonged and persistent inability to operate at a profit" as a result of import competition. There would have to be "significant idling" of the production facilities.

Translated into everyday language, the company must have to lose money persistently and for a prolonged period of time because of imports and this must have resulted in shutdowns significant enough to impress the President or his agent, before eligibility for technical assistance, low-interest loans, and so forth, could be established.

The whole effect of this provision would be to kill the present escape clause. Hardly a shadow of it would remain. The hope of getting relief in the form of a tariff increase would be almost nil and it would be a rare case indeed that could qualify for such relief, considering the lack of feeling for domestic industry reflected in the very spirit of the bill.

To create wards of the Government in the fashion contemplated in H.R. 9900 would indeed indicate that industry had no friend in the Government, for the proposed treatment could hardly be advanced if real concern existed. The extent of dependence on the Government implied in the bill may be judged by irreversibility of the President's action; for there would be no appeal, not even judicial review.

I for one do not believe that there is not some much better solution or that we should turn our backs on the escape clause. While this clause has not been properly administered, or administered in a most negative manner, it should not be discarded. On the contrary, it should be amended in such a manner that it would do what it was supposed to do.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] hit the nail on the head. The State Department is aware that the negative administration of the escape clause has run its course. The record has caught up with it. It is due for a review. Now, instead of a review, we are served with this bill, which would pull our attention away from the main business and thus avert our efforts.

What is needed is a better escape clause, not a caricature of it in the form of a bill that would undo all that the Congress has done in its various amendments of the clause since 1951 to assure that the legislative intent was clear. This bill, H.R. 9900, would wipe away the actions of every Congress since 1951 that sought to strengthen the clause.

I think we should do some legislating on our own instead of leaving the initiative to the State Department on a take it or leave it basis.

Mr. Speaker, we have had more than enough encroachment from the State Department on our constitutional jurisdiction. It is Congress and not the State Department that is under obligation under our organic law to regulate our

foreign commerce. Now the State Department presumes to tell us through the President what sort of legislation we should consider. This maneuver should be rejected for what it is: namely, a debasement of Congress and the enthronement of the State Department in a field that belongs to Congress.

The gentleman from Georgia is to be commended for taking the lead today in this crucial battle. I thank him for allowing this expression of strong support.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in all the explanations and interpretations of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there are admissions that some domestic industries will be hurt by the proposed reduction in tariffs. Consequently, some thousands of workers will lose their jobs. Nowhere that I know about is there any definite information on which industries will be hurt, which areas of the country will suffer most, which employees will lose their jobs. Are we not entitled to this information? Can the State Department or the Departments of Commerce or Labor furnish the Congress with substantial estimates? Surely the Congress must have answers to these questions before it can vote intelligently on this far-reaching proposal.

The President would be granted vast powers over business and labor under this proposal. In essence the President may eliminate all duties of 5 percent or less and transfer those products to the free list. Other duties are to be reduced 50 percent over a 5-year period. In agreement with the European Economic Community—the Common Market—the President would be empowered to eliminate all duties on tropical agricultural and forestry commodities; eliminate all duties on agricultural commodities; eliminate all duties on commodities where the United States and EEC together account for 80 percent of world export value. Furthermore, the determinations by the terms of the bill "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court." The authority requested is sweeping, and should errors or oversights occur that might prove dangerous to the economy, there is no recourse. For this reason, if for no other, the Congress must exercise great care in its analysis of this proposed act. This is no ordinary extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is a whole new concept of foreign trade.

It should be noted that in his message to Congress on January 25, 1962, the President talked about world trade but in the proposed act the references are to export value. The act includes no definition of world export values. It is obvious that the term "world trade" as used by the President will be understood in its usual sense; namely, as referring to buying and selling.

The term "export value," as used in Government statistics, includes the value of merchandise exported by the United States for which no dollars are received. In hearings on H.R. 6611 before the Senate Finance Committee, Senator HARRY F. BYRD characterized this method as deceitful. The trouble with this sort of statistic is that export value includes aid as well as trade.

No reductions in duties on imports are required to persuade other nations to accept gifts. No international trade agreement is required to reduce the amount of gifts. Gifts by our Government should not be considered trade. Neither gifts nor increases in gifts should be counted in determining a concentration in the United States and the European Economic Community of 80 percent of the world export value in any category of commodities.

I also have a deep concern about the effects of the act on our policies toward Cuba. As I read section 211 of the Trade Expansion Act, exports from the Common Market countries to Cuba in replacement of the goods the United States now declines to sell to Cuba may also be included in calculating the 80 percent of the aggregate world export value. But this section does not apply only to Cuba. Exports to Red China, the Soviet Union, and other Communist countries from the six present nations that make up the Common Market and from any additional members or affiliates at the time of the calculation are included. There is a large amount of exports from the free world to Communist nations. A recent estimate of these exports shows that it is about \$4.4 billion a year.

Thus, in some category the export value of United States trade with all the world may amount to only 20 percent and the Common Market exports to the Communist bloc may bring its total to 60 percent. The act would authorize the President, under such circumstances, to reduce or eliminate U.S. duties on any or all articles in such category. If this standard of the act becomes law, the Common Market nations could demand the reduction or elimination of such U.S. duties. The President, we hope, would resist such demands but at the risk of creating friction or worse with our major trading partners. This is an example of the looseness with which many sections of this act are drawn.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to be overly technical about these matters, but this is a highly technical proposal. H.R. 9900 is not an easy bill to digest. Section after section is qualified or nullified by other sections. As a result of propaganda in support of H.R. 9900 it appears that many segments of the public, some of the press, and possibly some Members of Congress have accepted the fallacy that the present tariffs on imports into the United States may not be reduced more drastically and more rapidly than by 50 percent in five equal annual installments. There is no such limitation on all the reductions in duties authorized in the act. Section 201(b) of the act does provide for reductions in duties not to exceed 50 percent of the rates existing on July 1, 1962, and section 243 does make some provision for reductions in five equal annual installments. But these portions of the act are extensively qualified by important exceptions in the act. Let me cite a few examples: If the rate of duty is 5 percent ad valorem or less, the duty may be completely eliminated in the first year under section 202. Section 243(b)(1) states that where the total reduction is not more than 25 percent of the July 1, 1962, rate,

such reduction may be made in 1 year. There is no 50 percent or other percentage limitation on the amount of reductions in rates of duties on agricultural commodities or the products thereof. Section 212. Technical perhaps, but vital to many domestic industries.

This leads me, Mr. Speaker, to another question I believe the Congress needs answered. What will the duties on imports to the United States be on July 1, 1962? GATT recently concluded extensive tariff negotiations and the United States took part in these sessions. The results have not yet been announced. Will the new rates be made public before we are asked to vote on H.R. 9900? It seems to me that the Congress is entitled to this information. Before we authorize a further 50 percent reduction in tariff rates, the Congress should know what is involved. Fifty percent below what duties? I, for one, Mr. Speaker, want some answers.

Some Members of Congress have serious qualms about this proposal. They spring from the administration of the act, should it become law. The President cannot watch all the details. The authority must be delegated and, as in the past, it will be delegated to the State Department. I think that most Members who come from States and Districts with industries sensitive to unregulated imports are concerned about this. The State Department is not noted for its devotion to domestic industries. It has shown little patience over the years with complaints that imports were flooding U.S. markets despite the fact that mills and factories were going out of business or on sharply curtailed employment. The textile industry is a case in point. The same is true of apparel plants. Lead and zinc, pottery, glassware, boots, and shoes, gloves, the list is long. The State Department, in the past, often took the position that these lines were obsolete, inefficient, or both. There is a dearth of men and women in the State Department who understand the intricacies of industry. Without detailed knowledge it is impossible to know the effects of tariff cuts on many industries. Generalities simply will not do. In the United States we have many one-industry communities. They are the economic lifeblood of these areas, and the effects on these communities must be measured before the Congress rushes into authorizing tariff cuts.

Another phase of this program is, I am sure, of great importance to all Members. This is the effect on our national defense. Will the Military Establishment be consulted before the State Department takes any action that might result in the elimination of some domestic industry? There is now pending, as the Members know, a petition before the OEP filed by all sections of the textile industry for a determination of the essentiality of the industry to the national defense. When the OEP will report to the President I do not know, but I, for one, would like to see this report before the Congress votes on H.R. 9900.

Once again I urge the Members to beware of statistics, generalities, and oversimplification in evaluating the effects of H.R. 9900.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for the statement he is making and for his long and untiring fight against this free-trade proposal.

Mr. Speaker, countless Americans among the millions affected, directly or indirectly, by President Kennedy's almost unprecedented new 1962 requests for vast powers to shape a brand new international trade and tariffs program are wondering if he is actually talking about the fundamental American economics studied by every schoolboy in this country.

In his message to Congress on January 25, 1962, President Kennedy said in part:

Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group * * * who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports.

Let us look at an official figure of the U.S. Department of Labor released on January 25. It stated that about 3,100,000 workers in the United States owed their jobs to the Nation's export trade. It is generally accepted that the 1960 working force totaled 70 million, which leaves a balance of about 67 million Americans who, for all practical purposes, owed their jobs to domestic operations.

Now let us take a look at some of the U.S. industries vulnerable to imports, industries which would be importantly and immediately susceptible to dislocations, possibly even mortally injured, if the Congress abdicates its major responsibilities and grants the sweeping powers asked by President Kennedy. Remember that the President is not asking for a few simple changes in the Nation's pattern of trade and tariffs. He is pressuring Congress for a gigantic package on a 5-year arrangement.

If enacted, this legislation would "permit the gradual elimination" of tariffs here and in Europe on "those items in which we together supply 80 percent of the world's trade—mostly items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that we sell abroad substantially more than we import."

On other goods, and this would open a second Pandora's box, the act will permit a gradual reduction of duties up to 50 percent.

What would the elimination of tariffs and wide-open free trade do for those innumerable products, made in countless cities and towns around the country, that fall within the category of 80 percent of the world's trade? And how many thousands, and even tens of thousands, of workers and their families, would be directly left without means of support, and on public relief rolls, if the President cut in half the tariffs now shoring up the last remaining ramparts against the low-labor-content wages of many alien competitive products?

With respect to the hard-pressed textile and allied industries, the President himself has expressed public concern, thus contradicting his own statement. The textile mill products industry has about 891,000 workers, and the apparel

and related products industries represent about 1,225,300 workers.

But what about the ghost towns and breadlines arising from other U.S. industries vulnerable to imports? According to the U.S. Department of Labor, "Employment and Earnings," January 1962, chemicals and allied products account for 834,000 workers; leather and leather products, 362,900; rubber and miscellaneous plastic products—other than tires—278,400; rolling, drawing, extruding of nonferrous metals, 176,800; electrical industrial apparatus, 172,600; scientific instruments, optical goods, and surgical and dental equipment, 161,800; electronic components, 160,600; fabricated structural steel, and metal doors, sashes, frame and trim, 156,000, et cetera.

Any American schoolboy can do his own addition on these figures of these numerous industries jeopardized by wide-open, free trade, or duty reductions aggregating 50 percent, and judge for himself whether the total of Americans affected will be small.

President Kennedy and the tremendous lobby pressuring Congress for this legislation, in toto—a veritable blank check for 5 full years—conveniently neglect to mention the unemployment situation prevailing in this country. Unemployment is a perennial problem. For 32 years, except for wartime and relatively brief periods of boom, unemployment has fluctuated between 4 and 25 percent of the labor force. In the Wheeling, W. Va. area—an area, where President Kennedy personally made unfilled promises when that State was a springboard to his nomination—unemployment is officially about 16 to 17 percent. It is generally agreed that the Nation's unemployment is in the neighborhood of 4.2 million. Meanwhile boom conditions prevail in Japan, Italy, West Germany, and other areas poised to flood the United States with cheaper competitive products made with low-wage labor and, in many instances, produced on post-World War II machines furnished in full or in part by the American taxpayer through the continuing giveaway programs.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] may revise and extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] and I am happy to have before me the sentiments expressed by him.

The legislation proposed in H.R. 9900 represents a sharp departure indeed from the existing law. From the experience that we have had with the administration of the present law, particularly the escape clause, the expected legislation should have been something designed to correct the weaknesses of the law, that is, it should have strengthened the escape clause so that industry, the workers, and the farmers would have had greater assurance that when they faced

destructive import competition the supposed remedy would have come to their support.

Unsatisfactory as the administration of the escape clause was—and it was only about 10 percent effective—at first blush it appears that the present bill would not only do nothing to improve it but would emasculate it. I find it very difficult to understand. I feel sure that the sentiment in this body was that what was needed to make it possible to live with the trade agreements program was a tightening up of the escape clause to make it more responsive to its intent. Instead of that we are offered a bill of the opposite character.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that this legislation is offered as an offense to forestall the kind of legislation that is really needed. In other words, a strong offense is the best defense. Other than that I can find no justification for the new proposal. It is intended to head off fulfillment of all the promises made by past Presidents and Secretaries of State.

The very spirit of H.R. 9900 is alien to these promises and in fact repudiates them. One wonders where the mandate comes from. This bill brings no comfort to the many industries and producers who are struggling against the toughest kind of import competition. It seems to say that if these industries cannot compete they are ipso facto inefficient and that they may as well prepare to succumb. The indictment is wholly unjustified and the treatment proposed is in the nature of punitive exposure for failure to compete when much of the inability to do so is directly attributable to burdens imposed by law.

Our domestic industries bear cost burdens to which their foreign competitors are not subject at all. After imposing many competitive handicaps on our producers we would now penalize them for inability to compete. This is too much like tying a man's hands behind his back and then condemning him for his poor fighting performance. That our industries and their workers and our farmers, to whom we look for increasing production and expanding employment, should be treated in this fashion seems unbelievable.

Above all, it seems like an odd approach to the economic growth that is called for if we are to meet the challenge of employment in this country. How can we expect the many industries that are battered by import competition to expand their plants or to build new ones in this country when the market outlook for expanded sales is gloomy? And if they fail to do this, the workers who otherwise would be employed will find no openings.

Many firms have been driven to overseas investment for this very reason, and let no one minimize the negative effect that this pressure to expand abroad rather than in this country has had on employment. It stands to reason that when hundreds of companies expand outside of this country rather than inside of it, the drag on employment is serious. One company alone, namely the Ford Motor Co., invested some \$365

million in England rather than in the United States. This was merely the most dramatic example. Many others did the same and others are following suit.

Now, to say that this trend has played no part in creation of the so-called hard core of unemployment is to ignore what has been going on at a rapid pace. This has been in response to the competitive outlook both here and abroad.

To try to correct this trend by increasing import competition through yet deeper tariff cuts passes my comprehension. The very idea that you can stop the bleeding of a wound by cutting deeper into it, is nonsense of the first order.

It is said that we must export more in order to put people to work. In order to expand our exports we must buy more; and in order to do this we must cut down what is left of our tariffs. In other words, if we want to enjoy the growing Common Market in Europe we must bring about a reduction of the outer tariff that is to ring the Inner Six. To do this we must offer reciprocal concessions in this country.

The supposed effect would be to halt the outward movement of our capital to Europe because we could ship directly from the United States. Mr. Speaker, this would be a forlorn hope for the simple reason that the advantage would still lie in manufacturing in the Common Market. Moreover, those of our companies that had already established themselves inside of the outer tariff wall would participate in supplying the expanding market within. They would not ship from this country but take advantage of the lower costs over there. This advantage would continue, and would still confront all American exporters who had not invested within the market with the need of doing so since that would be the best if not the only way of selling within it.

The European countries themselves would not look with such great favor on our further tariff reductions on products that now come predominantly from Europe, once they realized what it would mean. It would be an open invitation to Japan to come in and give the Europeans a run for their money in this market. In other words, if we removed our tariff on certain imports from the Common Market Japan could also ship in here without paying duty.

We should not be stampeded by visions of vast sales in a fast-growing market in Europe. Principally we will be on the outside looking in, except to the extent of our investment within the market.

Japan has grown more rapidly than Europe in point of gross national product; but in physical volume of goods we are buying more in Japan than we sell there. Our imports from Japan are about 95 percent manufactured products, usually labor-intensive goods, whereas raw products predominate in our exports to Japan. In terms of employment we are getting from Japan easily twice as many man-hours of work

as are involved in the production of the goods we sell to Japan. Given time Japan will build additional industries, many of them with the help of our own manufacturers. We may not look to Japan as a vast market for our manufactured goods; and yet it is in the field of manufacturing that our heaviest productive employment exists, rather than in the production of raw materials. While in terms of value we export to Japan more than we import we run a deficit in terms of employment in our trade with her.

The proposed legislation is somewhat unrealistic because it fails to face the facts of competition and the source of employment and unemployment. The best inducement to industrial expansion in this country will be found in assuring a better investment climate. This does not involve cutting off imports or reducing trade. All that is involved is proper regulation of import competition so that it will not stand as an obstacle to market development and sales promotion.

This country is a strong believer in competition. In that respect we have pioneered and led the world. At the same time we have striven to assure the fairness of competition and have placed many laws on the statute books to that end. Witness the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. These acts were all enacted to prevent monopoly and to prevent unfair trade practices.

We went beyond that. We undertook to prevent sweatshop wages and employment of child labor from bestowing competitive cost advantages on the practitioners of such employment practices. We passed the minimum wage and maximum hour laws and made collective bargaining obligatory. All of this was done to prevent unfair practices from giving a competitive advantage.

These laws necessarily stop at our national boundaries. We cannot legislate for other countries. We cannot offset their competitive cost advantages that arise from practices that would be illegal in this country except by regulating the condition of importation. The recognized means of doing this are the tariff and the import quota or a combination of the two.

We should not deprive ourselves of these proper and appropriate defenses against the effects of practices in foreign countries that would not be tolerated in this country.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The question I would like to ask the gentleman involves a real effort on the part of those of us who represent the textile industry to work out a serious program that would be helpful to the textile industry. It is our understanding that our representatives in Congress did work out a program, a 5-year program which applied to a large segment of one of our industries,

textiles—at least it is acceptable in part. The question I have is this: If we are able to negotiate for the textile industry, the President advises us he will do something for wool and other fibers, why does that not set a pattern for all industry?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I would say in reply to the gentleman's statement that it may set a pattern, but would the pattern be followed? The gentleman has spoken of only one particular industry. There are many industries which will be affected by this so-called trade extension and trade agreements bill in addition to those which the gentleman has named. I can name a dozen.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. So can I.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Steel, plywood, sewing machines, watches, bicycles, chemicals, glass, paint—the list is as long as your arm.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. My point was that if we were able to negotiate effectively in setting up a 5-year program which was suggested why could not other 5-year programs be set up following this pattern? We would suggest that the same general pattern be followed, and that we set up 5-year programs for all of the industries that may well be affected seriously by this flood of imports.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. If we could be assured that the U.S. Government on its part would negotiate in keeping with this pattern, if we could be assured that the governments of the Common Market and the governments of Europe and Japan and the others involved in this problem would negotiate on their part, if we could be assured that those negotiations would result in an agreement satisfactory, that would give the proper consideration and relief to our industries, then we could. Such assurance we do not have even under the kind of negotiations which our Government would carry on, let alone negotiations other governments would carry on, so there is nothing we can rely upon so far as they are concerned.

I want to say this to the gentleman, if that is going to be the pattern, why does this bill H.R. 9900 carry all of these provisions for subsidizing American industries which would be injured by the so-called agreements? Why does it carry the agreements that workers will be subsidized, that workers will be retrained? If there were any intention of doing what the gentleman suggests there would be no point whatsoever in having these provisions in the bill.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I agree with the gentleman and that is why I think that having made a good case in one industry we could move forward on that basis.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. We may have established a pattern, but there is no assurance that the pattern will be carried out.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. If we have been successful in one industry why could we not be successful in many others?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Well, I think this bill is far from being a unanimous bill as it now stands.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

BRAVE NEW WORLD

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the new trade bill, H.R. 9900, that has been presented to Congress represents what is called a bold new foreign economic policy.

Widely touted by State Department officials in Washington and the big city newspapers of the East, the program is designed to open our gates to more and more imports from abroad by lower tariffs. Any injury to a community or to an individual business establishment would be compensated through Federal Government handouts, or "readjustment assistance". This means that loans would be given to businessmen injured by imports to go into new businesses; and employees would get extended unemployment compensation and be retrained for new jobs. No provision is made for farmers or ranchmen, or farm workers who are driven out by imports, for reasons not disclosed.

Now, no American is against foreign trade. Obviously we need it. Many products are not produced here in sufficient quantity to supply our vast American market. For simple examples, there are coffee, bananas and many minerals such as tin and asbestos.

Nor can anybody be against foreign trade in manufactured goods where the ground rules of competition are relatively fair—where the foreign goods are not underpriced because of sweatshop labor and are not attempting to devour the entire American market.

But, and this is a big but, the real problem is just that. In many agricultural products such as lamb, cattle, barley, and rye, and industrial products such as pottery, hardwood plywood, glass, athletic goods, carpets, tile, and many others, the imports have swamped our markets. They have curtailed farm output and caused plant closings and have thrown hard-working American citizens out of their jobs.

Now it is said by the State Department that we must have imports if other countries are to buy the products which we manufacture for export. Other countries must have dollars to buy our exports. Yes, this is the case but the matter must be kept within reason. In our import policy, emphasis should be given to those products which we cannot readily supply ourselves.

Again, it is said by the State Department that imports keep our prices in line and avoid inflation. This argument is phony. Under our antitrust laws, we have the most vigorous competition in the world between domestic manufacturers. Where imports come in, way below the competitive domestic prices, it means that the American producer or manufacturer eventually has to sell below cost or go out of business—with resultant job losses.

It is an easily verifiable fact that from 1950 to 1960 employment on our farms

dropped by 2.8 million. This was a 28-percent decline.

Yet we continued to allow imports of many competing farm products to grow from year to year.

These farm workers are thrown on industry. Not all of them soon find employment. Where do they fit in this bill, H.R. 9900?

Agricultural unemployment did not come from inefficiency. Quite the contrary. It was caused by rapidly rising farm productivity. Why then let imports aggravate the situation? They claim imports of some industrial products are justified on the grounds that our industries are inefficient. That is just as false an indictment as it would be if it were aimed at the farmers.

We do not know what happens to the farmworker who loses his job. Let us look at what the loss of a factory job means.

What does the loss of a manufacturing job mean not only to the man, but to his community? That, of course, is a little hard to compute with precision. However, the average wage earner, city or rural, has a wife and at least two children. Thus, loss of his job—and at the time of high national unemployment—means that not one but four people in a community are deprived of a livelihood. In other words, if a plant with 100 workers closes down, that means that 400 people are placed in dire financial straits.

But we are not just talking about the jobs in the plant itself, and the employee's family. We are talking about every job in the community. Dollars paid to a factory worker are spent and respend several times in a community. For example, dollars spent at the grocery store may be used to pay the wages of grocery employees who, in turn, may buy other goods or place the money in the bank.

It is authoritatively estimated that, for every 100 jobs permanently lost, a community is deprived of at least \$360,000 in annual retail sales; \$270,000 in bank deposits; 107 automobile registrations; 112 households; 74 jobs in other enterprises; and 4 retail establishments.

In addition to this, other significant cutbacks must occur, such as reduced Federal, State, and local tax revenues; greater outlays for unemployment compensation; declining school budgets; less income for charitable purposes.

These figures give an idea of the chain reaction effect of a job lost to a community through imports.

And yet, the State Department is demanding we cut our present low tariffs to let in more foreign imports—and our tariffs are much lower than those in almost every other country—and still the State Department wants to cut our tariffs by 50 percent. Cutting the tariffs in half will mean increased floods of imports, and not just in those industries already hard hit but in many others, for which there remains some moderate American tariff protection, including some farm products.

On top of that, the tariff on farm products could be removed completely in negotiations with the Common Market under section 212 of the bill, provided only that the President determined that it would assure the maintenance of expansion of U.S. exports of the commodity, or products made of it. This could have untold ramifications and cause uneasiness in almost any farming operation.

This would bestow entirely too much power on any President, and I would oppose it regardless of who might occupy the White House.

Today, growth seems to be the favorite word here in Washington. Our rate of national economic growth is inadequate, we are told. We are told we are slipping, and we are not keeping pace with other nations. If we do not grow faster, the Russians will get us and so on. Yet how can we have growth when imports stunt or destroy industry's ability to create the growth? If Congress enacts the program being propagandized by the State Department, it will hurt our national economic growth, not help it. Who will expand his plant when he sees nothing ahead but more and more imports?

We are told this: Yes, the imports are necessary and if the working people are injured by them, Government money will be available to help out.

This helping hand is not extended to farmers and farmworkers and I do not say that it should be. It has no place in any tariff bill. Nevertheless, let us look at the facts here. If a manufacturer is forced to close down, he is to be given Federal help to help him go into another business. First of all, what is the other business? If it is there, why is somebody else not in it? The answer is that somebody else is in this business and presumably getting along or he still would not be in it. Now to take a man who is manufacturing plywood or pottery and give him some Federal money and Federal technical help to go into the missile or electronics business does not make any sense at all. First, the plywood or pottery man does not know anything about the missile business, and he certainly is not going to grasp the know-how overnight in anything so complicated in this space age. Then if the Government gives him tax money to help him get started in the new business, all that means is that the Government is in effect taking the money from the people who already are in going businesses, and giving it to somebody new.

Then take the worker. Let us take a plywood worker. The skilled operator of a complicated saw is out of a job. Let us say Washington wants to retrain him into an electronics worker. First, can Washington really do this? Second, does he have to move a thousand miles to get a new job in a new field?—even if one is available?

And the problem is even more complicated in the case of a worker who is, let us say, in his fifties. Washington can train him to be the best electronics mechanic in the world and ship him off to

San Diego, but he would still find it almost impossible to get a job at his age.

Now let us examine this matter as one might one's own conscience.

Let us each look at our own situation here in his own community.

When the manufacturing jobs go, the retailer loses sales and ends up with more bad debts.

Bank deposits will go down; newspaper advertising will fall off; taxes will fall off and the community will need to borrow money and interest rates go up.

Congress should reject this State Department program. It should substitute a program which would encourage reasonable quantities of imports but would prevent any domestic farm operation or industry from being mortally wounded by import competition. Our Government should give every industry adequate tariff protection to keep operating, to save jobs, and to spend money for more growth.

American businessmen and workers do not want Federal handouts. They want their present businesses and jobs. They do not want to be treated like retreaded tires. They want prevention, not surgery. All they want is to compete with foreign products under ground rules which create fair and equitable terms of competition.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned at some of the implications of the publicity program which is going on to promote the foreign trade legislation.

Personally, I am in favor of doing whatever we can to stimulate the export business of this country and I understand that imports are the natural concomitants of exports. I want to give the bill fair and objective consideration. But this House and the Nation at large can only give the trade program fair consideration if we have certain factual information upon which to base our judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a news release issued by the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, dated January 29, 1962, which states:

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges today disclosed results of nationwide survey by the Bureau of the Census pinpointing for the first time the value of manufactured products exported from each of the 50 States during 1960.

The release goes on further to say:

This new survey reveals for the first time the specific stake each of our 50 States has in reaching rapidly expanding free world markets. I think these figures provide all of us with graphic proof of that vital stake, and will help us to do even better in the future.

The statistical tables accompanying the release set out some figures which are clearly not supported by my own investigation in the District of Columbia. This is a discrepancy which I think must be explained. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this

time so that the Members may have the benefit of any comment, correction, or revision the Secretary of Commerce wishes to make.

The item to which I have reference is alleged export of printed matter from the District of Columbia in the year 1960 to the total dollar volume of \$4,600,000. This seemed to me to be an unusually large amount, and so I made some personal inquiries.

The result of a necessarily brief investigation was to learn that in the District of Columbia there are only seven printing houses that employ more than 100 employees. The Secretary's release purports to be based on information solicited from companies in that category.

The survey, based on questionnaires returned by companies employing more than 100 workers for each plant exporting more than \$25,000 in 1960, also provides State-by-State estimates of exports by major product group.

Yet a spokesman for these printers has advised me that they did not advise the Department of Commerce that they had exports of \$4,600,000 in 1960. On the contrary, I was informed that they had actually notified the Department of Commerce that they had no exports in the year 1960.

Mr. Speaker, for the Secretary of Commerce to make an estimate of the value of a certain kind of export is one thing. For the Secretary to publish certain figures as facts resulting from a survey is another thing. For the Secretary to publish as facts certain figures actually contradicted by the subjects of the survey is a third and very different thing indeed.

As I have stated, I bring this matter to the attention of the House that the truth can be established before action on the trade policy proposals is commenced. I intend to ask the Secretary of Commerce to comment on this discrepancy between his survey and my own. Perhaps there is a valid explanation, and if there is, I shall, of course, advise the House of it.

Even if there is no reasonable explanation forthcoming, I hope that this inquiry will serve a useful purpose.

I, for one, am truly concerned by the problems of trade policy that confront the Nation, by the adverse balance of payments, by the fate of many American wage earners which depends to a greater or less degree on exports. I welcome the opportunity to make an objective and comprehensive survey of the problem and the proposed solutions, and to take constructive action suited to our circumstances.

But if the Members of this House are to do these things successfully, they must have facts. They must have information which is accurate and in which they have confidence. I hope that the Secretary of Commerce can restore my confidence in the figures he published on January 29, or at the very least, will give us such assurance as may be necessary to give us confidence in figures that may issue from his office in the future.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to applaud those who are not overwhelmed by the torrents of propaganda that have been loosed over the land by the Government departments and agencies and the various private groups that have been shouting for the new tariff proposals of the President. I do not recall ever before witnessing anything quite so blatant and filled with exaggerations and distortions as this campaign.

As someone else has remarked, they must have a very doubtful production to sell if they have to rely on ballyhoo to this extent.

And that exactly is their trouble. They do have a doubtful product to unload; and in trying to unload it on the public they are using worse than dubious methods. They are using false statistics, unsubstantiated claims and bald guesses and are generally relying on exaggerations and suppressions to sustain their message.

It is an unseemingly thing to do. The amount of executive lobbying has been appalling. A vast amount of literature, paid for by the taxpayers, has been disseminated and continues to fill the mail bags; and it has had one thing in common: it is all in support of the proposed drastic tariff-cutting program. This means that money is taken from the opponents no less than from the supporters of the bill, to conduct propaganda that in the opinion of a great many people is not in the national interest.

There is a natural human revulsion against asking a man to pay for the digging of his own grave. The taxpayer should not be asked to contribute to Government propaganda that he regards as being against his best interests and indeed detrimental in a very concrete way. Yet the Government, because of its powerful position and with access to all means of communication, sees nothing wrong with saturation of the propaganda media in this fashion.

You will find false statements continuously disseminated and perpetuated because no editor seemingly bothers to check the original guess or estimate. So long as the substance of it sounds good and supports the Government's position it is repeated, both by the Government and the outside supporters.

For example, it is said that only 30 percent of our imports compete with domestic production. Yet, dutiable imports represent slightly over 60 percent of total imports. If they are not competitive why was a tariff levied on them? Also, of our total imports finished manufactures, semimanufactures—that is, material processed to some degree—plus manufactured foodstuffs now account for two-thirds. Moreover, some duty-free imports are themselves directly competitive with domestic products. Fresh and frozen tuna provide a good example; and

also newsprint, of which we import a great volume. Iron ore is also duty-free but it competes with our Minnesota and Michigan iron ore. Crude rubber is another competitive item on which we levy no duty. Imports are quite heavy.

No doubt the purpose of this kind of irresponsible if not premeditated distortion is to convey the idea that further drastic duty reductions would do little damage because competitive imports are made out to be such a small part of the total.

It has not occurred to these minimizers and shrinkers of unwelcome facts that if they carry their argument too far they will kill their own contention that further tariff reduction would be helpful to this country and to the world. Why bother so much over a proposal that would affect only a small part of our trade if it were adopted? If import competition is of little moment anything that we might do with it would produce only miniscule consequences.

The facts, of course, are different. Beyond the industries that are now exposed to import competition, additional ones that have thus far been relatively immune, will come into competitive range as the other industrial countries expand the variety of their products, develop new industries and saturate their home markets. Even today a number of industries that previously were little affected by imports are feeling the rising impact. Tile, steel products, radios, typewriters, binoculars, automobiles, chains, nuts and bolts, cantaloupes, strawberries, grass seeds, baseball gloves, flat glass, carpets, golf balls, wire rope, plumbing hardware, tennis rackets, and so forth, are examples of products that have in recent years become awakened to import competition; in some cases of a very sharp and distressing variety.

Another common assertion is that we had a \$5 billion surplus in merchandise exports over imports in 1960 and a little more in 1961.

This is not a false assertion but conveys a wholly false impression. Those who give utterance to this bald fact are taking advantage of the woeful and culpable lack of information available to the public on the seamy side of the trade program. Nothing but the good news gets to the public. The adverse part is suppressed, smothered or greatly muted.

It is not that attention has not been called to the makeup of this so-called \$5 billion surplus. It has been done time and again but the facts do not reach the public. By and large the newspapers are in support of the freer trade program and have acted as willing and even eager purveyors of the official handouts. They have done little or nothing to establish the accuracy or inaccuracy of the propaganda statements.

The most misleading use commonly made of the \$5 billion surplus in exports resides in the claim that this surplus demonstrates that we are competitive in world markets. Otherwise we could not run up a surplus. No mention is made of the fact that the total export figures

that include the surplus also include foreign aid exports, as well as exports of goods sold for foreign currencies; of cotton, wheat, and wheat flour, which in 1960 amounted to \$2 billion but which were subsidized to the extent of some \$550 to \$600 million in order to move them.

Nothing is said of the outright gifts that are counted as part of the export total. Little mention is made of the low-interest loans that have been extended in recent years to foreign countries. These give rise to exports that would not otherwise come about.

The maneuver, involving suppression of unwelcome facts, exaggerations of favorable trends, and so forth, is one that would fail completely if the reading or listening public were more fully informed. The cynical statecraft thus indulged in feeds on ignorance, and for its success depends on ignorance. This ignorance, however, may not be the fault of the public. It arises from the failure of newspapers and other media to fulfill their obligation to a public that is too trusting and too readily accepts what is printed or said by presumably public-spirited persons.

The fact is that our imports of nearly \$15 billion represent the expenditure of more man-hours of work and therefore would mean more employment in other countries than was necessary to produce the \$20 billion worth of goods that we exported.

The fact of our greater exports in terms of value does not mean that we are exporting more than we are importing; nor does it mean that we are universally competitive in overseas markets. It does mean that the \$5 billion export surplus is artificial and spurious in terms of physical volume of goods and as evidence of a healthy competitive standing.

Yet another fallacy which the free-trade promoters feed to the public is that foreign wages that are much lower than our own do not confer a competitive advantage on foreign producers. We are so much more productive, it is said, than foreign manufacturers, miners, farmers, fisheries, lumberers, and so forth, that we can afford to pay much higher wages and still come out with lower cost of production per unit of output.

At one time there was some truth in this view, since other countries generally were far below our level of productivity. Today this is very much changed; and as other countries install more and more modern machinery and equipment and modernize their production methods, their productivity per man-hour will continue to rise. Already, especially in the past 5 years, productivity has been rising rapidly in a number of the European countries and in Japan. Yet the wages continue to lag far behind those prevailing in this country. In order for them to catch up, even in 10 or 20 years, it would be necessary that our wages stood still.

To build a foreign trade policy on the notion that our wage levels will be frozen

until wages in other industrial countries come abreast of ours would be to condemn our industry, our agriculture and our labor to stagnation and our economy to a sure collapse. The further drastic reduction of the tariff, as proposed in H.R. 9900, would under these circumstances spread ruin throughout the land. Our industry would emigrate at a rising pace and in time would leave behind a mere shell into which foreign goods would pour for awhile; but the import boom itself would not last long. It would dry up because our economy and its purchasing power are based on employment of our workers in productive pursuits, not in mere trades and services.

Nevertheless the discredited and outdated assertion that low foreign wages do not offer a competitive disadvantage to us continues to be uttered and repeated in quarters that must know it no longer reflects the true state of affairs.

If we but reflect on the movement of the textile, particularly the cotton textile industry, from New England to the South we should be able to draw some useful lessons from movements in response to lower wages. This migration was slow, covering more than 40 years, and is now about 90 percent complete. Nevertheless, despite this slow pace it created great industrial havoc and much human distress in many New England areas.

If we keep in mind that the difference in wages between New England and the South was not as great as it is between this country and foreign countries, particularly those of Japan, we can guess how much more disruptive would be the exposure of our industries to free trade.

H.R. 9900 proposed 50-percent tariff reductions in 5 years and free trade in what appears to be a considerable segment of the total import volume in a similar period of time.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the rapidly rising productivity abroad, I say this would spell inevitable disaster to many of our industries. Let me add that I cannot bring myself to understand how the new tariff proposal can be put forward seriously. To my mind it can represent no more than a strong offense that has been launched as offering the best defense. I cannot believe that the proposal is serious. If it is, then it is indeed a serious matter.

Beside the distortions and exaggerations that I have mentioned many others are current. One of them is the claim that 4½ million workers are employed in foreign trade. That would be about 7 percent of our total employment; but our exports are about 3.7 percent of our total national product. The two figures are nearly 100 percent apart.

These are only some of the examples. There are many others. I hope that before we finish with this subject it will be possible to present to the public the facts as they are rather than the fare served by governmental and other propagandists. The executive lobbying in this legislative effort is appalling and should be curbed.

When the executive begins to lobby the legislative branch it should become

subject to the Lobbying Act and the expenditures on this activity should be made public along with those of all private lobbyists.

I am happy to associate myself with the position of the gentleman from Georgia and thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the outpouring of official propaganda on the new trade program from the executive branch, including the State and Commerce Departments, no less than the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, is beginning to arouse an echo in the Congress.

One would think from reading the newspapers and magazines or listening to commentators of radio and TV that there is barely more than one side to this issue. Certainly the vast bulk of the news and information contained in this flood of words is on the side of the administration's proposal. The official propaganda is usually treated as gospel while very niggardly treatment is given to the responses made by the opposition.

It is, of course, a disservice to the people of this country to serve them with such one-sided news and opinion. No issue lies above proper airing, especially when it is before Congress for legislation. The trade issue should be no exception. Yet, because the predominant press opinion is in support of the trade proposal the issue is not being aired as it should be.

It has been virtually impossible, for example, to get any light on the Common Market other than the glowing accounts that emanate from its sponsors and promoters.

I believe that my colleagues would be much surprised to learn, for example, that the highly touted trade expansion within the Common Market was much more impressive in percentage terms than in absolute terms. It may sound very impressive to say that trade expanded "by just over 50 percent both in volume and value" among the six Common Market countries from 1958 to 1960; 1958 being the first year of the effectiveness of the Treaty of Rome on which the Common Market rests.

The statement is designed to show how beneficial the Common Market has been to its members.

Now get ready for the facts that will explode the bubble. This will hurt a bit because the facts make us feel that somehow we have been taken in by the Madison Avenue type of publicity. I quote now from the "Information Memo" of the European Economic Community dated January 1962 and marked P-221, page 7:

Though trade within the Community (i.e., the Common Market) is constantly expanding, it still represents no more than a small part of total production; between 3 and 4 percent in Italy, 4 and 5 percent in

France, 6 and 7 percent in the Federal Republic of Germany, 13 and 14 percent in the Belgo-Luxembourg Economic Union, and 18 to 20 percent in the Netherlands.

In other words, with the exception of the Benelux countries, the intra-Community trade has been of slight importance and a 50-percent increase still does not make it important.

We have also been told how prosperous the EEC—Common Market—countries have been within the past few years. This fact is supposed to impress us with the value of the 30-percent tariff reduction that has been made internally.

This interpretation overlooks the equally prosperous condition of the other European countries, including Norway and Sweden, Denmark and even Austria. Japan, which is far removed from the Common Market, has enjoyed the most amazing growth of all.

There is a great deal of good to be expected from the Common Market, but we do little to enhance our own reputation for sound judgment if we accept the superficial and promotional statements at their face value. After all, the Common Market is but a mark of the awakening of Europe to the enjoyment of a mass market such as this country has enjoyed for many generations.

The Market is therefore to be applauded for what it will do for the participating countries. It was not set up with the idea of helping the United States; rather with the idea of making up for lost time in catching up with us.

We on our part are not called upon either to try to get into the Market or to associate ourselves with it. Unquestionably we should look after our interests, but this does not mean that we are bound to offer further concessions to the EEC. Even to suggest this is revolting, considering what we have already given without much in return. It is now generally admitted that our concessions, that is, tariff cuts since 1934, so far as Europe was concerned, were not reciprocated, and were in the nature of trading horses for rabbits, with the United States providing the horses and receiving rabbits in return.

Having given away four-fifths of our tariff we are now to slice the remainder in half and in some cases to cut it to zero as an inducement for better tariff or other custom treatment for our goods exported to the Common Market.

The curious logic behind such a proposal is made stranger yet when we reflect that our imports from the Common Market countries increased 300 percent from 1950 to 1960 while our exports to them increased only 112 percent. This fact should be enough to demonstrate that the Inner Six already have ready access to our market and that if we make further slashes in our tariff we will be overrun by imports. These will not be confined to the Common Market countries, for Japan and all other non-Communist countries would receive the benefit of all our tariff reductions. We cannot be selective in our tariff cuts because of the most-favored-nation clause.

It was with this fact in view that the proposal is made that we work toward free trade with the Common Market countries on products with respect to which our trade with them is 80 percent or more of the total. The loophole was evidently overlooked and we can rest assured that Japan would seize the opportunity. It would take her only a short time even if she had not yet developed either her exports or her industry in the particular products on which we had granted free entry before she would challenge the Europeans in our market. She would have free access the same as the EEC countries and could readily out-compete them in our market. The United States would become a competitive battleground between Japan and Europe and it needs no second guess to select the winner.

Europe will not, I am sure, enter into any such arrangement with us; and almost certainly would not offer us any inducement by way of tariff reductions on our goods. The European countries will know that they cannot compete with Japan, and many of them for this very reason have not extended most-favored-nation treatment to Japan. This is to say they have not extended to Japan the concessions negotiated with the members of GATT, whereas we have done so since 1955. We have, indeed, undertaken to prevail on them to recognize Japan as entitled to most-favored-nation treatment with respect to duty and other trade barrier liberalization, but have thus far had no success. The European countries are not nearly as anxious as our State Department to visit ruin on their own industries. No such ruin has so far been involved in the establishment of a customs union within the Common Market as some feared. The process is not yet half completed; but the labor and living standards are not nearly as wide apart among these countries as between them and Japan. Therefore no disruption of consequence has so far resulted. Nor are the standards as far apart as between this country and the Common Market. This makes a great difference.

The terms of H.R. 9900 suggests a complete misreading of the competitive realities. The European countries on the other hand are realistic. In putting forward the present trade proposal we are leading from a base of romantic notions that will be fractured on first exposure to reality.

The EEC countries are prosperous today. They are cautiously removing import restrictions among themselves as they can afford to do so. This is also true to a lesser extent with the seven EFTA countries. When it was to their interest all these European countries after the war were highly protectionist, and used devices that were more stringent than mere tariffs to protect themselves, such as import licenses, exchange controls, import quotas or even complete embargoes.

Were protectionism as ruinous and crippling as our free-trade philosophers would have us believe, it is strange that the extreme practice of it in Europe did

not sink them economically forever. Instead it helped them immeasurably to get back on their feet, with our aid. Without protectionism they could easily have dissipated our aid with nothing to show for it. With protectionism they pulled themselves out of a deep hole.

Now it is we who are in a position of needing some protection and we should not shrink from it. Our overexposure to import competition is at odds with our efforts to overcome the unemployment problem. It is therefore astounding that we should be offered a bill that would vastly increase this exposure. The very proposal must proceed from an abject failure to read the competitive status of this country as it faces the other industrial nations of the world.

Let us consider the fact that of our total imports a growing share consists of competitive manufactured goods while the trend in our exports is in the opposite direction. More and more of our exports are falling into the category of raw materials or merely processed articles. A smaller percentage consists of manufactured products.

When we consider what this means in terms of employment we should think twice about the magic of foreign trade. We are increasingly importing products that have more man-hours of labor incorporated in them because they are fully or semimanufactured while exporting increasingly those that have fewer man-hours incorporated in them because they are raw materials or processed products.

This is not a winning process for us. If we had no concern for unemployment we could look with equanimity on this trend; but compounded with mechanization and automation we are forced to give it serious thought, and we should refuse to give further impetus to the already mounting trend toward labor displacement. Certainly an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Already we have our hands full with retraining of manpower. It would be an inexcusable step to add to it deliberately by enacting a bill such as H.R. 9900. We are in trouble deep enough as it is without deepening the hole by an act of senseless self-mutilation.

There are those whose pulse quickens when they think of the great increase in consumer goods that will be needed to meet the prospective demand in Europe and they want to be inside. Well, they are getting inside as fast as they can through investment by the hundreds and that will be the extent of American participation. We cannot pry the market open far enough to make us competitive; and in any case our own investors who have gone in over there will not be eager for relaxation of import restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that out of a sense of wanting to do something, or wanting to get into motion, any kind of motion, we have H.R. 9900. I am afraid that we could be committing this country to a course of action that would have to be reversed in a few short years, with very unpleasant if not explosive consequences. That is what I see ahead if we go along with H.R. 9900.

I agree that we need a remedy to the damage that has already been done rather than heaping more damage and discouragement on our industries that are struggling with unfair import competition without a remedy.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for opening this discussion and leading the way.

MAILINGS OF OBSCENE MATTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that a great many Members of the House have been shocked and distressed, as I have been, by the rising volume of vicious and horrid advertisements being sent through the U.S. mails by unscrupulous merchandisers of obscenity and pornography. Indeed, my deep concern is tinged with a sense of shame, also—as well as anger—that our great postal service is being made the unwitting tool of these “pornographers for profit.”

I have here just a few samples of the hundreds of complaints sent just recently to Members of Congress demanding that their children and their homes be protected from a campaign of filth being waged by a smut merchant going under the name of “EROS” that is spawning its advertising solicitations through the mails from New York City. This material consists of photographic and printed material obviously intended to incite immoral interest. Much of it has been sent indiscriminately to schoolchildren and adolescents, but adults by no means have been overlooked.

We have found numerous instances of the entire student bodies of schools being circularized with invitations to open their young minds to this kind of evil and suggestive material, and some of the complaints from parents express opinion that mailing lists are even being used to invade such fine and worthwhile endeavors as the Boy Scout and Girl Scout movements.

Mr. Speaker, this condition is intolerable and I believe it is high time that we carry out our responsibility here in the Congress to restrain the muck mongers who are trying to destroy the moral fiber of our younger generation. I call attention to the bill which I sponsored for the purpose last year, H.R. 2425—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. This bill will lay down a firm, effective, and workable congressional policy by providing clear standards for determination as to obscene content of mailings to persons under 19 years of age or enrolled as students in elementary or secondary schools. It will provide the machinery, also, for swift and sure punishment of any smut peddler who uses the U.S. mails to solicit these young people or send obscenity to them.

I am sure the membership will agree that this is a nonpartisan responsibility. The distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], ranking minority member of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, and the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] also sponsored legislation for the purpose and joined me in appearing before the Judiciary Committee last year urging action on corrective legislation. I will take this opportunity again to appeal to the distinguished chairman and the members of the Committee on the Judiciary to give this urgently needed legislation favorable consideration so that the penal statutes to rid the mails of obscenity and pornography may be strengthened in the interest of our young people.

With respect to the samples of the nationwide mailing campaign by the EROS, as chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee—and by unanimous agreement of the subcommittee—I referred some of the early complaints to the Post Office Department and requested prosecution. The Department, in two special reports dated February 2 and February 5, 1962, advised me, in effect, that upon review of the material and consultation with the Department's General Counsel and representatives of the Department of Justice; it had been determined that prosecution would not be instituted because, in the light of the Court decision in the "Lady Chatterley's Lover" case several years ago, the EROS mailings were not deemed in violation of the postal obscenity criminal statutes.

Confronted with material such as the samples I have shown here today, I for one cannot rest with this conclusion and at the same time discharge the moral and legal responsibilities imposed on me when I took the oath of office as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I sharply disagree—and the Postal Operations Subcommittee disagrees—with any judicial or other attitude of thought by which this kind of unmitigated vile-ness can be viewed as not obscene. It is worse than suggestive. To borrow a well-worn phrase from judicial decisions—and to apply that phrase correctly—this stuff plainly is calculated to appeal to "prurient interests."

Accordingly, I will today send to the Postmaster General of the United States and to the Attorney General of the United States letters expressing the strong views of our subcommittee—and, I believe, of the membership of this House—that the U.S. mails no longer can be permitted to serve as go-between in this firm's "pornography for profit" plans, and urging reconsideration of the Post Office Department's reports to me, to be followed by prompt and effective action to close up this dirty business once and for all. I include the texts of these two letters in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUB-
COMMITTEE ON POSTAL OPERA-
TIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1962.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL DAY: Since receiving Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague's reports of February 2 and February 5, in response

to my inquiries of January 29 and 30 concerning objectionable advertising literature being sent through the mails by EROS of New York City, our subcommittee has continued to receive complaints against EROS from all over the United States—many of them directed to individual Members of Congress, who have forwarded them to the subcommittee.

We certainly recognize the existence of obstructions to successful prosecutions that have been posed by judicial decision, such as that in the "Lady Chatterley's Lover," but at the same time feel that neither that decision nor the various other impediments and difficulties in any way justify an overly cautious attitude on the part of Federal authorities who are responsible for enforcing antiobscenity postal and penal statutes. We are aware, also, of the excellent record of progress made by the Post Office Department in its enforcement activities during the past year and heartily commend you and your staff for this record—while urging still greater efforts in the public interest.

Personally, I am in sharp disagreement—a disagreement in which members of my subcommittee unanimously concur—with any judicial or related attitude of thought that material such as is flooding the mails from EROS can be viewed as not obscene and contrary to American standards of public dignity and morals. It is worse than suggestive; it is, to borrow a phrase in which various tribunals have placed much reliance, plainly a detailed and calculated appeal to "prurient" interests. Worst of all, the pattern of mailings confirms our subcommittee findings that a great part of these solicitation campaigns by EROS and its fellow travelers is being directed at the children and adolescents who are entitled to every protection of our laws and our society.

I do hope, therefore, that the Post Office Department will again review its position with respect to the mailings by EROS and find grounds for legal proceedings to keep this firm's filth out of the U.S. mails. I am directing a similar request, with a copy of this letter attached, to the Attorney General of the United States to enlist his full cooperation and assistance. A copy of my letter to the Attorney General is enclosed.

Meanwhile, in view of the widespread interest in the Congress and of the special concern of our Postal Operations Subcommittee, it is requested that the subcommittee be furnished a complete and documented report comprising copies of all opinions and decisions relating to mailings by EROS (and others under the same management) and samples of such of their mailings as have been or are being considered by the Department in the course of the performance of the Department's responsibilities under the postal and criminal antiobscenity statutes. The subcommittee plans to thoroughly review the entire matter at a special meeting during the early part of April of this year.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUB-
COMMITTEE ON POSTAL OPERA-
TIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am enclosing copies of my letter of today to Postmaster General J. Edward Day and of earlier correspondence with the Post Office Depart-

ment concerning the use of the U.S. mails by EROS of New York to send advertising solicitations which, in the judgment of this subcommittee and many Members of Congress, are obscene or are directed toward an obscene purpose. This matter is brought to your personal attention because of the responsibilities of the Department of Justice under the criminal statutes relating to unlawful use of the mails, and the reference made to Department of Justice officials in the Chief Postal Inspector's letter of February 5, 1962, submitted in response to my inquiry of January 30, 1962.

Our subcommittee is most deeply concerned at the continuance of a condition which permits the filthy products of EROS (and others under the same management) to move through our great American postal system. It is particularly obnoxious to find such damaging and destructive matter carried by public servants at preferential postage rates which are subsidized in considerable part out of the taxpayers' pockets. This is an unwarranted and unacceptable drain on the public treasury—in aid to one of the most insidious and dangerous enemies of public dignity and morality—at a time when every dollar and every ounce of our Nation's strength is needed in our vital defense effort and in combating the threat of international communism.

Both personally and on behalf of our subcommittee and the mothers and fathers and children of America, therefore, I earnestly solicit your most vigorous efforts to remedy this intolerable situation and remove our postal facilities from their position of being unwilling participants in the "pornography for profit" dealings of EROS and its fellow travelers.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH,
Chairman.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania that the important subject which she is discussing is in no way a partisan problem, nor is there any lack of interest on our side of the aisle in her efforts to obtain an adequate remedy. I would like to congratulate her on the long fight that she has made against obscene literature and against its transmission in the mails. I would like also to give her signal credit for her service in the House. She has been an honorable asset to the women Members, and certainly an asset to her party. In the meantime, I assure her that I join her in support of her legislation under discussion, and hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will take the necessary action to bring the measure to the floor for action.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAH], the chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee of which I am ranking minority member. We have worked long and hard on this matter of pornographic material. We have given it exhaustive

study over the last 3 or 4 years, probably more than has been given to it for a long time. We have been able to produce some legislation but not legislation that really is effective enough. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania and I and other members of the committee realize that we have to have legislation that will divorce the adult mind from the juvenile mind so that when prosecution is brought in connection with pornographic matter, the jury will determine or the court will determine whether it is obscene in the mind of the adult or is obscene in the mind of the minor only. There is a difference.

There is a difference. I may be able to view a piece of obscenity and it would have no effect on me or other adult persons. My teenagers might receive this material which might have an adverse material effect upon them.

Mr. Speaker, we have appeared before the Judiciary Committee in an effort to try and work out some type of legislation to make this distinction, as the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] so well knows, and has pointed out, we have not been able to get that type of action. But we are working on it, and I congratulate again the chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee, Mrs. GRANAHAN, whom I worked with on this matter for the past several years.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his very fine support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

OBSCENE MATERIAL IN THE FORM OF GREETING CARDS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention one way in which obscenity is being sent through the mails. Recently some young teenagers walked into a greeting card store, innocently looking for birthday greeting cards. There on the counter in full view were other cards which were quite obscene, and quite unfit for public display even to adults. Certainly we are painfully aware of the problems of juvenile delinquency and are bending every effort to eliminate those conditions in our society which contribute to the corruption of our young people. However, if we permit the display and mailing of obscene material in the form of greeting cards, we thereby undermine all of our efforts in the areas of education and religion, as well as those made by parents in the home.

Although such greeting cards do not come within the purview of statutes prohibiting the sending of obscenity through the mails until they are actually mailed, it is obvious that material sold in the form of greeting cards will eventually be put into the mails. Second, it might be possible for the District of Columbia Committee to look into this matter which bears directly on the morals and well-being of the District's children. Since it is obvious that the question of free speech is not at issue here, there is no need for the display and mailing of obscene greeting cards to be continued any longer.

VOTE ON H.R. 10264

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce to the House that there is a strong possibility that we will vote on the bill, H.R. 10264, which we have had under discussion today, at about 5 o'clock, and not prior thereto.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive Congress, I have introduced legislation to provide for equal pay for equal work for women. For many years, this has been a major concern for me and for many of our colleagues in Congress. The issue is one of fundamental justice, fairplay and equality. It has been a long time since anyone seriously tried to justify the practice of paying women less than their male fellow workers receive for the very same kind and quality of work. Yet, for reasons which surpass logic, the discrimination has continued to exist.

During my service in the New Jersey State Assembly, it was my privilege in 1952 to sponsor equal pay legislation and lead the successful fight for its passage. Our experience in New Jersey, and similar experience in many other States, should provide an overwhelming amount of evidence to demonstrate the usefulness of the legislation on a national scale.

It has been my observation that the more people know about this legislation, the more they understand the conditions it is designed to correct, the greater their support of our efforts becomes.

The need for national legislation is, I believe, very evident. The existence in interstate commerce of wage differentials based on sex has depressed wages and living standards, prevented maximum utilization of labor resources, caused labor disputes, burdened commerce, and constituted an unfair method of competition.

The benefits of such equal pay legislation are equally apparent. Passage of the bill would benefit the entire economy. Women today are an important part of our total labor force. Their earnings contribute significantly to the well-being

of their families and help to increase our national wealth. Equal pay would stimulate economic activity by helping to maintain consumer purchasing power to a high level. It would also reduce the unfair competition of those who attempt to undercut wage standards by employing women at lower wage rates than men. Conversely, it would help protect the fair employer.

Men workers, themselves, would benefit from passage of the bill. Equal pay would help to stabilize wage rates and increase job security by discouraging the replacement of men with women at lower rates.

But the basic issue is a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker. Comparable work should be paid for at the same rate, whether the work is done by men or by women. The rate of pay should depend on the job, not the sex or size or shape or color of hair of the worker. To discriminate on such shallow and essentially irrelevant bases is completely unjustifiable. We have waged and are continuing to wage a national fight against discrimination of all kinds. It is appropriate and important that we eliminate at the earliest opportunity the discrimination against women in the matter of compensation for their work—one of the oldest and most pernicious forms of discrimination on record.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, support for this position has been growing steadily over the years. Between 1919 and 1959, 20 States enacted laws requiring equal pay for equal work for women. Both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations have supported this objective on a national basis. Women's organizations, civic organizations, labor unions, and employer's associations all support the principle of equal pay. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce last year urged employers to adopt voluntarily pay practices which accurately reflect the value of services performed by women. The National Association of Manufacturers termed the principle of equal pay soundly based, and the AFL-CIO Executive Council has endorsed Federal legislation to provide equal pay for equal work for women.

A representative list of other supporting organizations indicates impressively the broad backing this principle and this legislation have earned: the American Association of University Women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the League of Women Voters, the National Consumers League, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, the United Church Women, the National Council of Negro Women, the National Education Association, and the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, among many others.

I join many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I express the hope that the hearings scheduled on this legislation for later this month before a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee will be the first in a series of concrete steps toward enactment of Federal equal pay legislation.

AIRPORT OWNER'S LIABILITY FOR NOISE DAMAGE

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on Monday in the case of Griggs versus the county of Allegheny will have the most widespread ramifications in the field of commercial aviation. How extensive those ramifications will be, no one can say, since the Court ruled on the basis of a single and unique factual situation.

But this much is clear: As a matter of principle, the Supreme Court has extended its landmark decision of 1946, involving liability for damage caused by military flights, to the field of commercial aviation. Whereas in United States against Causby, the Court held that the Federal Government must compensate property owners near military airports for the taking of the property as a result of damage caused by military flights, so the Court on Monday extended the principle to protect property owners in the vicinity of civil airports.

Although the Court divided, 6 to 2, on assigning liability in the most recent case to the operator of the airport, it is especially significant, it seems to me, that the Court was unanimous in deciding that the noise and vibration caused by low flights can make property so useless as to constitute a taking of the property for public use. And, of course, the Constitution requires that "just compensation" be paid for any property taken for such public use.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, even though liability has been established at the airport operator level, civil aviation in the United States is such a completely integrated industry that all other phases are intimately involved, including the airlines, aircraft manufacturers, and the Federal Government. No part of the civil aviation industry can any longer escape responsibility for the effects of aircraft noise on public airport neighbors. This, I believe, is the major significance of the Supreme Court's decision.

As many of our colleagues know only too well, especially Members who represent areas in which commercial airports are located, the question of aircraft noise has never received the serious attention it deserves. Airport neighbors who have complained about excessive noise levels have usually been dismissed as nuisances. "Passing the buck" has been a favorite pastime, with airlines, manufacturers, airports and the Government each insisting it is not solely responsible for the problems created by noise and each suggesting that someone else should take action. As a result, such efforts as there have been to control noise have frequently been halfhearted, haphazard, tentative and generally inadequate. No well-coordinated, national attack has ever been waged on aircraft noise, despite the fact that the advent of jet aircraft into scheduled airline operations has made it more apparent than ever that nothing less than such a comprehensive effort will be effective.

As recently as last fall, this conclusion was strikingly substantiated in the Report of the Task Force on National Aviation Goals, "Project Horizon," which was submitted to the President and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. The report stated in part, and I quote:

Another field of air terminal operation in which the Federal Government must expend great effort is aircraft noise. The head-on conflict between aviation interests and communities and property owners adjacent to airports is too important and basic to progress and the Nation's commerce to permit indifferent treatment of the problem by our Federal authorities. The need for the air traveler and air shipper to have available aviation facilities close to his points of origin and destination, and the right of the property owner to the peaceful use of his property without unwarranted interference from aircraft noise and flight, are both in the Nation's interest. The situation calls for a massive technical attack by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, and private industry on the problem of engine noise, with particular emphasis on turbine powerplants.

I do not minimize, Mr. Speaker, the extreme complexity of the noise problem. Nor do I wish to underestimate the attempts of individual groups who are presently engaged in the detailed research and experimentation necessary to reach a thorough technical understanding and control of noise. As I have indicated, however, complexity is not an excuse for inaction, and the research and other efforts to control noise have to date been scattered and insufficiently supported. While no responsible person would recommend closing airports or grounding aircraft in order to prevent noise, I do not believe that excessive noise can be justified simply by talking about the importance of aviation progress and stressing the great contributions which aviation has made to the national strength and well-being.

If aviation is as significant as people in the industry claim it is—and I, for one, am in complete agreement—then it becomes equally important in their own self-interest to see that the noise hazard is brought under control.

A major part of the impact of the Supreme Court decision in Griggs versus County of Allegheny, I suspect, will be to delineate more clearly than ever the nature of the aviation industry's self-interest in noise abatement. The convenience, health, and safety of persons living in the vicinity of airports has not been a sufficiently compelling factor, it would seem, to obtain top priority industry attention. But now, with the Court's decision and the possibility of additional and successful litigation it suggests, the factor of economic interest has entered the picture. No one likes to lose money, fortunately, and if the threat of losses due to noise damage will be a greater incentive than humanitarian concerns, then I suppose we should be grateful.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that people who have been annoyed by aircraft noise should rush out, retain a lawyer, and file suit for damages. Not only would this be highly irresponsible,

but under the very strict standards stated and implied in the Court's decision, such suits would seem to have very little chance of success. For the time being, it seems to me, it is enough that those persons who have suffered demonstrable damage from the excessive noise and vibration caused by low-flying aircraft in the vicinity of airports should be afforded an opportunity to recover real and provable damages from the responsible agency, in this case the airport operator.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, it becomes a matter of protecting airport neighbors as a whole from the ill effects of noise by mobilizing the available resources of industry and Government in order to find effective ways of reducing noise levels. This is the constructive approach which I hope will result from the Supreme Court's decision.

There are a number of things that can be done:

As the Project Horizon task force pointed out, it is essential from an operating standpoint that the Federal Aviation Agency establish and enforce standards of aircraft noise exposure and noise abatement rules applying to aircraft operations in and out of airports. This will require legislation, and shortly after the report was issued I requested the assistance of the FAA in drafting appropriate bills. After more than 2 months, the Agency is still considering its interim reply—which fact may, in a small way, indicate rather strikingly the less than urgent attitude that prevails in the FAA with regard to the noise problem.

This is not an isolated instance. Last summer, for another example, the Washington Post published a copy of a noise map prepared by FAA to show the extent of noise to be expected at the Dulles International Airport when jet aircraft begin operations there. When I inquired about the relevance of such noise statistics for Newark Airport—where, at that time, jet operations were being considered—the FAA replied that the Dulles noise map was based on the performance of a Boeing 707-120 aircraft, loaded at maximum gross weight of 247,500 pounds, and was therefore inapplicable to Newark Airport since such an aircraft could not operate from Newark due to insufficient runway length. The Agency pointed out, however, that it had negotiated a contract to obtain accurate noise levels emanating from 16 various types of commercial aircraft. They said the contract would be completed in mid-November of 1961.

As of yesterday, Mr. Speaker, nearly 4 months after the scheduled completion date for a noise study of vital importance, the FAA reported they were hopeful the study would be completed this summer though it was evident they were not too hopeful.

These illustrations lead me to my second recommendation: that the Federal Aviation Agency abandon its business as usual attitude toward noise control and undertake a vigorous, concentrated drive to harness the resources of industry and

government and bring the noise hazard under control.

Two other recommendations of the Project Horizon task force should receive priority attention. First, the FAA should be given authority to establish standards for the design and manufacture of commercial aircraft, especially aircraft powerplants, reflecting maximum limits for noise output. Since this is the point at which noise originates, this may well be the only point at which noise can be controlled effectively. This will also require legislation and I have requested FAA assistance in drafting a bill. Second, local communities should make whatever changes are necessary in their zoning ordinances so as to reclassify land in the critical areas close to airports from residential use to industrial or recreational use. Noise, of course, works in both directions. It is just as objectionable for private housing to encroach on airports as it is for airports to overwhelm housing. Better overall planning by local communities or, preferably, by cooperative regional planning agencies, could be very helpful.

In a related area, a great deal of improvement in the noise situation could result from closer coordination between Federal agencies having responsibilities related to airport planning. Airports don't exist in a vacuum. They need highways, public utility services, transportation facilities, and the like. They are also surrounded by industrial, residential, commercial and other neighborhoods. Consequently, the Federal Aviation Agency is not the only governmental body involved. The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its several constituent units also has a role to play, as does the Bureau of Public Roads. All such agencies should be following a common policy with regard to airport location and noise control. This is the kind of responsibility, incidentally, for which an Office of Urban Affairs should be established in the Executive Office of the President, as I have heretofore proposed.

Before coordination can do much good, however, there must be a basic policy to be coordinated. Unfortunately, from extensive past experience, it is quite clear that the Federal Government has no comprehensive airport location policy. Despite the fact that commercial aviation is a business that covers the globe, essentially local decisions are still determining the location of giant jet airports designed to serve the entire Nation and a good part of the globe. Clearly, the Federal Government has some measure of responsibility for establishing appropriate standards, standards which would deal with noise control, access to population centers, transportation, and similar considerations. A national policy could help eliminate the often wasteful and time-consuming local squabbles by assuring local communities that their legitimate interests were being protected.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Project Horizon and Project Beacon reports last year would deal in greater detail with this matter and advance a pro-

posed national airport location policy. While both reports contain valuable observations and recommendations which would be a part of such a comprehensive policy, no detailed or systematic policy was suggested. Likewise, the FAA and Civil Aeronautics Board have agreed on individual statements of policy on matters relating to airport planning, development, and location, but these have been limited in scope. What is now called for, I believe, is creation of a national commission by Congress or the President to be charged with the responsibility of developing as soon as possible an overall airport policy which will put order and system and advance planning into the location of the Nation's great jet airports.

Mr. Speaker, last year the House approved a resolution directing its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a comprehensive study of the effects of aircraft noise on persons and property on the ground. I understand this study has been assigned to the Special Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies, and the subcommittee is currently engaged in the investigation. The Supreme Court's decision in *Griggs* against County of Allegheny has given this congressional study new importance and urgency, and I am sure our colleagues join with me in expressing the hope that the committee will pursue the study with the sense of immediate purpose which is called for. Despite the complexity of the technical questions that remain unanswered, a great deal of information is now or will soon become available. Even though final answers or ideal solutions may be unobtainable in the near future, the available information ought to provide a basis for sound recommendations for action that can be taken now, at least on an interim basis, to help give us needed relief from excessive aircraft noise.

I should like to make one final observation, Mr. Speaker, about the noise problem which concerns local airport authorities exclusively. Over the years, I have found that one of the principal causes of public dissatisfaction with aircraft noise is not only the noise itself but the attitude toward the problem displayed by the airport operators. If airport operators would take the public into their confidence and deal frankly with public concern about noise, much misunderstanding and fear and frustration could be avoided.

I have in mind, by way of evidence, the entirely unsatisfactory way in which the Port of New York Authority has handled the matter of jet operations at Newark Airport. For several years, the authority continually denied any intention of permitting jet service at Newark. At the very time of these denials, however, the authority was making plans for lengthening runways at Newark and otherwise equipping the airport for such jet operations. When these plans were revealed through publication of the FAA's annual national airport plan, the resulting public uproar led the authority

to withdraw its application for Federal assistance. Then, last year, when the port authority finally determined to initiate jet operations at Newark, it announced that flights would be limited both as to number of jet takeoffs and departures and it indicated that such flights would be restricted to short- and medium-range distances with so-called medium jet aircraft, such as the French Caravelle. The Governor of New Jersey specifically based his approval of the plans on these limitations. Within a matter of weeks, however, these limitations were discarded, without public explanation and without public approval by the Governor. Today, coast-to-coast jet flights in numbers far exceeding the original plans are common. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the people who live in the vicinity of the Newark Airport should be severely distrustful of the Port of New York Authority?

Most people, Mr. Speaker, do not oppose aviation progress. But they do expect a certain amount of candor from aviation authorities, a certain amount of necessary preparation for the advent of jet operations, and a reasonable degree of assurance that everything is being done to protect them from the dangers and disruptions of excessive noise.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Supreme Court has placed all these considerations in a new and more immediate perspective. I hope that Congress, the administration, the aviation industry and all concerned with aviation progress will now make renewed and determined efforts to bring aircraft noise under control.

HELPING COMMUNISM SUCCEED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELL] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, last September in enacting Public Law 87-195—the foreign aid bill—the Congress plainly prohibited the furnishing of assistance by the United States to Communist-bloc nations. In section 620(B), language was inserted which stated:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

That this provision of law applies to Poland is clear. Indeed, in testifying before the House Select Committee on Export Policy, Secretary Rusk has stated that in developing U.S. policies toward Poland it would be erroneous and dangerous to base such policies on the illusion that Poland is not tied to the Soviets within the bloc.

Quoting Dean Rusk's own words, he said:

It [Poland] is clearly a member of the Soviet bloc. It is bound to the U.S.S.R. not only through such formal instrumentalities as the Warsaw Pact, but also because

of its exposed geographic position and its heavy economic dependence upon the Soviet Union.

That Polish position on international issues is rarely distinguishable from that of the Soviet bloc was cited by Secretary Rusk as further evidence of Poland's membership in the bloc as was the presence of Soviet troops on Polish soil.

On the other hand, the policy of the United States under the Export Control Act is not so specific. It provides authority to the President to use export controls for the exercise of vigilance over exports from the standpoint of national security plus the furtherance of our foreign policy. This act makes policy a matter of Executive discretion and wisdom, and in this latter connection our policy has been to embargo all exports to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba, whereas exports to the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet-bloc countries have been only restricted to so-called nonstrategic exports. Poland, however, has been accorded special treatment and, indeed, recently Secretary of Commerce Hodges testified that our Government has been prepared to permit exports of even strategic goods when determination is made that such goods are necessary to the Polish economy.

Mr. Speaker, under our Export Act the determination and policy has been that nonsubsidized agricultural commodities were nonstrategic and as such no restrictions under our Export Control Act were placed on their export to European Soviet-bloc countries. Subsidized farm commodities, on the other hand, were classified as strategic. But on June 22, 1961, the Department of Commerce announced an easing of licensing regulations covering such surplus subsidized agricultural products so that now food under existing regulations is not considered related to our national security. With this determination, I strongly differ and later on in these remarks I will explain why. But right now let me emphasize that we have an inconsistent policy covering export of food. If it is aid, it is banned to the Soviet bloc; if it is under a program of trade, it is permissible under general license.

This lack of a firm policy, which actually amounts to no policy at all, was pointed up last week when a little band of patriotic American citizens exercising their constitutional right of free speech picketed the *Titan*, a tanker being loaded at Seattle with grain for Communist Poland. The group carried placards saying, "Grain Is Ammunition," "U.S. Subsidizes International Communism," "Planes; Wheat; What Next?" "90 million Loaves of Bread for Communism," and so forth.

These protests were lodged on the natural assumption that when Congress prohibited assistance to Communist-dominated countries, it made illegal this cargo of 26,800 tons of grain and 10,900 tons of barley.

Actually, the shipment was under an agreement consummated between the Polish and United States Governments

on December 15, 1961, under provisions of Public Law 480, title I. Under this agreement the United States allowed a credit of \$25 million estimated to cover 400,000 metric tons of wheat; \$5.7 million estimated to cover 100,000 metric tons of barley; \$7.7 million estimated to cover 24,000 tons of vegetable oil and \$1.8 million for an estimated 10,000 metric tons of tallow, with \$3.9 million for transportation costs.

Under this arrangement, the U.S. Government pays the U.S. supplier with dollars, while Polish currency is credited in a Polish bank to our Government based on 24 zlotys to an American dollar. Under this plan, as I understand it, the United States can eventually obtain dollars for zlotys if we wait for 30 years, and so while this transaction does not come under the foreign aid law and as such is legal, it nevertheless represents substantial assistance to Poland and is contrary to the spirit of the law and the intent of Congress.

I applaud the action of the U.S. citizens in expressing indignation but, as I have said before, the protest would be more correctly directed if it were to the President whose decision in the final analysis legalized the shipment under the Foreign Export Act.

Many times I have publicly expressed strong opposition to the shipment of grain to Poland or to any destination in the Soviet bloc, and let me reiterate my reasons why.

A shipment to one Communist-bloc nation is the same in my judgment as to any of the others. For example, Poland can help fill the grain gap in other bloc nations with her own products and consume the ones she receives from us to make up the difference. Thus, she does not have to resort to transshipping our exports for this purpose, although she could very well transship U.S. cargoes if necessary. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has admitted the calculated risk involved by permitting these shipments, stating that there is no effective check or means of preventing transshipments under the present regulations.

But, Mr. Speaker, here I must interpose that the policy issue with us really involves the question of whether grain, subsidized or unsubsidized, is strategic or not. That is the basis of the restriction in our export law. In other words, it is a matter of our national security.

So, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the policy of permitting grain shipments to the Soviet bloc, let me remind my colleagues of a news item earlier this week. I refer to the speech before the Central Committee of the Communist Party by Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev warning that if current farm problems in the U.S.S.R. were not solved communism would be "seriously damaged." Khrushchev said if the Communists fail to solve this task they will confront the Soviet Union with great difficulties and the cause of building communism—so he frankly stated—would be seriously damaged.

This admission of failure of agricultural collectivization ties in with recent free

world predictions that Russia's economy is in serious trouble and the significant aspect of the problem is the comparison of collectivization with the system of privately owned farms so clearly pointed up in the Soviet bloc. The only European Communist country not collectivized, Poland, was the only member of the bloc to fulfill its agricultural plan; in fact it doubled its planned increase. Elsewhere in East Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, where collectivization is rampant, the programs were not successful.

Indeed, Edward Crankshaw of the London Observer News Service was quoted in last Sunday's Washington Post as saying:

In food production, the Soviet Union, which should be the greatest agricultural country in the world, has a record which can only be called disastrous. With half the population on the land, it still cannot reliably feed the urban half. Whereas in the West agricultural production has grown at a rate far in excess of industrial production, where ever-diminishing numbers of field workers produce ever-increasing harvests, in the Soviet Union a monstrously swollen agricultural population can barely keep the country fed.

This article concluded that sooner or later the Soviet Union will have to abandon collectivization and in consequence much more besides. I suggest that those words "much more besides" are highly significant.

Mr. Speaker, when Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges testified recently before the House Select Committee on foreign export policy that the United States is prepared to permit export of even strategic goods to Poland, I suggest that to be more accurate he should have stated that the United States is presently permitting strategic goods to go to Poland. For food is just that as far as the Soviet bloc is concerned.

Shipment of grain, such as the grain shipment protested by the pickets in Seattle, is legal under a policy which in my opinion serves to prevent an economic and philosophical breakdown in the Communist bloc. Agriculture in Russia is throwing the Kremlin plan out of balance and causing discontent of Soviet citizens which could affect the outcome of the cold war.

Official Soviet reports on agricultural production lead Western authorities to the opinion that Kremlin planning and control are a failure so as to make it impossible for communism to win the battle of competitive coexistence with the outside world.

Our export policy, Mr. Speaker, ignores this situation. Last June, the Secretary of Commerce opened the door for shipments of surplus subsidized farm commodities to be shipped to the U.S.S.R. and this with shipments that have been going to Yugoslavia and Poland could solve the Communist problem and bolster their sagging collectivist system which is the heart and core of the Communist philosophy. If and when collectivism is destroyed, the entire structure of Marxist communism will inevitably collapse.

I have taken the position, Mr. Speaker, that the people under the yoke of communism must earn their freedom by hunger, hardship, and harsh sacrifice.

And, as for us, I hold that only if the United States reverses its policies of appeasement, compromise, and opportunism can we hope to win the cold war and thereby retain our free way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the Export Control Act expires in June. I have heard our Department of State favors a freer basis of exports to the Communist bloc. I hope that the Congress instead will remove the inconsistencies in the law and also I hope the law will be strengthened and that Congress will not only ban shipments of grain, but also will place an embargo on all trade with Communist countries.

Mr. Speaker, as an article in the March issue of Nation's Business points out, Russia's economy is headed for serious trouble, and industrial and agricultural disorders building up in the Soviet Union and most of its satellites constitute potentially the greatest threat to international communism to arise since Hitler's armies stood in sight of Moscow.

Why should U.S. policy be such as to help the Communists solve their chronic inability to stabilize food production? Why, when the record indicates ultimate victory could lie in a decision to let the Soviets stew in the collectivist juices of their own making?

Let us set an example to our allies and the free world. Let us show leadership and stiffen our foreign policy.

In short, let us set a course to win this cold war.

That is what the pickets for freedom in Seattle sought. As their banners read: "Food Is Ammunition."

Mr. Speaker, under our weak policy of expediency and softness we are burying ourselves. We are setting a stage for our children to be raised under communism.

We can win this struggle. We can earn anew our heritage of freedom.

Let us stop this policy of helping communism succeed.

Let us ban all aid to the Soviet bloc and watch the enemies of a free way of life engulf themselves in discontent and abdication.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I have asked the gentleman to yield simply to express my commendation of the speech that he is making. I commend the gentleman also for the strong stand and the firm actions he has consistently taken throughout the years he has been a Member of the Congress in bringing to the attention of the American public and the Congress the threat of international communism to the peace and well-being not only of our own Nation but of the nations of the world. I know of no Member of the Congress on either side of the Capitol Build-

ing who has more vigorously opposed Communist aggression here and abroad.

I am pleased to know of the reaction that has taken place in my own State with respect to the gentleman's activities. More and more people have been writing to me this last year than ever before, expressing their concern over the threat of communism. I think this is one of the reasons for the tremendous number of letters that have been coming to me, and many from the gentleman's own district, but also, many from my own. Many of the writers comment on the fact they have read articles in the press concerning statements and actions taken by the gentleman from Washington who now has the floor, endeavoring to get congressional action of one sort or another to combat Communist aggression.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question if I may. He has just made reference to the sale and export of surplus grain products to Poland, and he cites an instance that took place in the city of Seattle, as I understand. I gather from what the gentleman said that he regards surplus agricultural products as strategic products as much in many cases as would be the normally considered strategic materials such as armaments of war.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my colleague for his very kind words of support and state specifically in answer to his question with regard to the strategic nature of food that I intend following this point to dwell on that one subject, the very definite strategic nature under the conditions now existing in the Soviet bloc.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want the gentleman to know that I join with him in many of his activities and actions, and I want him to know that I have also introduced bills in the House to prohibit the sale or transfer of surplus agricultural products to known Communist or pro-Communist nations.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Addonizio	Chipfield	Harding
Andrews	Coad	Harrison, Va.
Anfuso	Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.
Ashmore	Davis	Hollifield
Avery	James C.	Hosmer
Baker	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Dent	McIntire
Blitch	Derwinski	Mason
Bow	Elliott	Meador
Broomfield	Garland	Miller, N.Y.
Chelf	Glenn	Moulder

Pfost	Rogers, Colo.	Ullman
Powell	Saund	Wickersham
Roberts, Ala.	Smith, Miss.	Wright
Roberts, Tex.	Udall, Morris K.	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3879. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1991) entitled "An act relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes."

INCREASING THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill H.R. 10264.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the Eighty-eighth Congress and in each Congress thereafter, the House of Representatives shall be composed of four hundred and thirty-eight Members.

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 2a) is amended by striking out "the then existing number of Representatives" and inserting in lieu thereof "four hundred and thirty-eight Members of the House of Representatives".

SEC. 3. (a) The statement transmitted to the Congress within the first week of the first regular session of the Eighty-seventh Congress by the President in accordance with subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, as amended, and the certificates sent to the executives of the States in accordance with subsection (b) of such section 22 shall be of no force and effect for the purpose of effecting a reapportionment under such section 22 of such Act of June 18, 1929.

(b) Within thirty days of the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement prepared in accordance with the provisions of such Act of June 18, 1929, as amended by this Act, and such statement shall, for the purposes of such Act of June 18, 1929, be held and considered to be the statement submitted in accordance with the requirements of such Act for the apportionment of the Eighty-eighth and the four subsequent Congresses.

(c) Where a State has redistricted after the 1960 apportionment but before the effective date of this Act, such redistricting shall

not be invalidated by this Act if the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled has not been affected by the provisions of this Act.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOORE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 10264 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the gentleman's inquiry, I would like to advise the membership first that this completes the business for this week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like at this time to inform the House that I have discussed this matter with the majority leader and with the Speaker and as far as I am concerned, it is perfectly all right to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to have the legislative program for next week before the gentleman from Oklahoma pursues his unanimous consent request to adjourn over.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to comply with the suggestion of my colleague and withdraw the request at this time.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, the minority leader, may I advise the House as to the legislative program for next week.

Monday is District Day. There are two bills that will be taken up on that day.

First, H.R. 9699 having to do with the sale of property.

Second, H.R. 8916 having to do with the George Washington Hospital Center.

Tuesday, the bill, S. 167, for the enforcement of antitrust laws will be taken up, and H.R. 10079, a bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, the bill H.R. 10606 relating to the public welfare amendments of 1962 will be taken up, if a rule is reported, also H.R. 10607—the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 will be taken up, if a rule is reported.

The conference report on the bill, S. 1991, relating to the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1961 will be taken up. That conference report may be called before Wednesday, I will advise the gentleman.

Thursday, the conference report on the bill, H.R. 8723, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act will come up.

Mr. Speaker, the above program is announced, of course, with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and, of course, any further legislative program may be announced at a later time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I have had inquiries on this side as to whether or not either of these conference reports may be called on Monday. The gentleman has indicated they might be called up earlier. I think it would probably be desirable if we could have the information as to the earliest day that they might be called.

Mr. ALBERT. May I advise the gentleman that the conference report on the bill, H.R. 8723, Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, will not be called before Thursday. The conference report on that bill will be called up on Thursday.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it be possible to have an understanding as to the conference report on S. 1991, Manpower Training and Development Act of 1961, that it will be called up not earlier than Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. I will agree with the gentleman from Indiana. That will be called up on Tuesday.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman explain what the conference report deals with?

Mr. HALLECK. I was inquiring with reference to the conference report on the bill, S. 1991, the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1961.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank my colleague.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ROOSEVELT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON MARCH 14 AND MARCH 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule next week on March 14 and the following week March 21 may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on the bill H.R. 10606, the public welfare amendment of 1962, and H.R. 10607, the Tariff Classification Act of 1962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

JOEY ADAMS: A GREAT AMERICAN AND AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that when man loses the ability to laugh, he has lost the world. There are parts of the world, however, where laughter is a luxury—where the harsh problems of everyday life would seem to preclude joy. Perhaps the greatest gift ever given to these people by our country was the chance to laugh—it was worth the equivalent of millions of dollars of foreign aid funds and, according to firsthand reports, those people will remember our Ambassador of Joy longer than they will remember our gifts of tools or arms.

That ambassador was Joey Adams, an entertainer, author, and I should add, diplomat and psychologist—a man of rare ability and great warmth. He has recently returned from a 4½-month tour of the Middle and Far East during which time he visited 11 countries and left behind him the smiles and gratitude of countless thousands of people.

Joey Adams and his 24-member troupe, which included his exceptionally talented and charming wife, Cindy, are to be commended by this House and by the American people for the successful completion of their mission. It was a mission first suggested to President Kennedy by Mr. Adams early last year. The

President and our State Department agreed with the wisdom of this suggestion and their opinion has been justified by the unqualified success of the tour.

It has been my extreme pleasure to know and work with Joey Adams, both in his capacity as president of the American Guild of Variety Artists and in many charitable functions in New York and throughout the country. He is more than an entertainer. He is gifted with charm, dedication, and a seemingly endless storehouse of energy.

This good-will tour has brought accolades from news media throughout the world. The mission has been heralded by representatives of our Government and by officials and other representatives of the countries covered by our diplomat entertainers.

Typical of the American press comments are those expressed by Lee Mortimer, the noted, widely read correspondent for the New York Daily Mirror, and by feature writer Leonard Harris in his full-page story in the New York World-Telegram.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these two articles as excellent summaries of the Adams tour. They give a capsule wrap-up of the Adams mission:

[From the New York Sunday Mirror, Jan. 7, 1962]

COMEDIAN OR DIPLOMAT? BOTH—JOEY ADAMS WINS UNITED STATES FRIENDS OVERSEAS
(By Lee Mortimer)

A clown—in a diplomat's role? Yes, and there's nothing funny about it—except the quips comedian Joey Adams dropped before audiences roaring with laughter in far places of the world.

Joey, who graduated to the big-time from the borscht circuit after a boyhood on the Lower East Side, headed a troupe of 23 introducing American humor and cementing international relations with smiles in some Far Eastern trouble spots. The trip was part of President Kennedy's special international program for cultural relations.

The troupe won rounds of enthusiastic applause—and columns of favorable newspaper comment—in friendly countries such as Thailand, Vietnam, and Iran, and in neutralists such as India, Nepal, and Indonesia. The results in good will for America exceeded all expectations.

Joey returned on Christmas Day from the 5-month tour which covered 12 countries. Yesterday—his 51st birthday—he spent in his Fifth Avenue apartment reading the pile of congratulatory messages from the crowned heads and cabinet ministers he had entertained.

From the little people in the audiences, he had already heard—with the sound of their appreciative laughter.

One of the plaudits he treasures most was the comment of the Prime Minister of Indonesia to American Ambassador Howard Jones:

"If the price of rice goes up the people of Indonesia will revolt, but if the price of Joey Adams' show goes up the people will pay it gladly."

Actually, where admission prices were charged at all, they were in most cases turned over to local charities. The U.S. Government paid the troupe's expenses.

Another tribute was from American Ambassador Nolting, in Saigon, who wired the State Department that his office was "highly

pleased with Joey Adams' contribution to Vietnamese-American relations * * * Adams' personal gifts in cementing U.S. Vietnamese relations most impressive."

Wherever the troupe appeared, Adams' pretty, witty wife Cindy introduced the acts in the native tongue—a gesture much appreciated by the people. The places visited included Afghanistan, Nepal, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Indonesia, Singapore, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, India, Pakistan, and Iran. The Queen of Cambodia decorated Joey. The rulers of Thailand and Afghanistan pressed gifts on him. The Empress of Iran, the Nepalese royal family and a Lao prince all honored him.

But the impressive honors haven't turned the head of the funnyman who can also be serious, as president of the American Guild of Variety Artists. To all the praise and adulation for his accomplishment on the trip, he replies with a quip "I'm very glad to have had this opportunity to serve my country—but I feel a bit self-conscious that the best way I can serve my country is to leave it."

[From the New York World-Telegram, Jan. 20, 1962]

STRIPED PANTS TROUPERS WIN RAVES FOR UNITED STATES
(By Leonard Harris)

Joey Adams can't count how many times he's stood in front of an audience and introduced a purely fictional joke with:

"This actually happened."

But, says the comic, who's just returned after heading a 4½-month, State Department-sponsored entertainment tour of the Middle and Far East, this actually happened:

"One morning in Saigon—at an orphanage—600 'kids' got up when our show was over and sang 'God Bless America' in English. 'People in hospitals—what did they have to be happy about?—beamed at us, laughed at us, reached out to us. Everywhere we put out a hand to people, they took it and shook it. There were no 'Yankee, Go Home,' signs, not one."

Joey first suggested the trip to President Kennedy about 8 months ago. The troupe played Afghanistan, India, Nepal, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore, and Iran.

Joey and his pretty wife, Cindy, and others in the 24-member troupe took turns giving English lessons. But they hurdled the language barrier mainly by emphasizing visual things, broad comedy, music, dancing, magic.

Like any performers on tour, they savor their memories of the things that "actually happened."

What they'll remember most is the faces—of the hospital patients in Thailand, the street full of Red Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, the lepers in a beggars' home in India. Especially the faces of the "kids" everywhere.

But like all performers, they'll remember the SRO audiences and the raves. Joey was proud to show some of the reviews, particularly the orchids from American officials who noted the effects on the local people. Here are a few:

"Comments from all sources regarding the show have been highly laudatory"—American Embassy in Katmandu, Nepal.

"Wonderful * * * Iranians feel most cordially toward the President and all Americans."—M. Ghaffari, Governor of Abadan.

"Your week's stay here has helped to bring cheer to a hard-pressed people and to give them a real feeling of America's sincerity

and warmhearted support."—Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam.

"Joey Adams' show delights"; "90 minutes of sheer delight."—Two papers in New Delhi, India.

"A packed house at Annamalai Manram last night roared with laughter witnessing the Joey Adams Variety Show."—The Madras (India) Mail.

Variety, writing under a Washington dateline, said: "State Department officials here point to a pile of reports from embassies and consulates throughout south Asia and proclaim that Uncle Sam's use of vaudeville as a good-will ambassador is a 'smash success.' The Joey Adams group * * * has drawn raves from American diplomats where they have performed."

Recently a veteran woman gossip columnist called the Adams tour a flop. This was contradicted by Heath Bowman, Chief of the State Department's Cultural Presentations Division.

"I must disagree with her," he said. "From reports from all our posts, from officials of the Asian countries, from numbers of people who saw it, we learned the tour was extremely good. It did a great deal for us."

"It played hospitals, orphanages, and charities. It played provincial cities. In Thailand, it went into the bushes; it played military camps and entertained wounded soldiers."

"We've never seen anything like this. In Kabul, Afghanistan, it played a fair. The Russians had a group at the fair, too. The Adams company completely eclipsed the Russians. We got a special wire from the Ambassador there thanking us."

Joey and Cindy Adams are proud that they worked a "24-hour day," giving shows at hospitals, orphanages, in the streets, in addition to scheduled performances. Mostly they entertained what Cindy called the plain "turban tops" of Asia.

"Many times we had no water, no electricity," she said. "We tramped through mud in evening gowns to get to our stages; we slept under mosquito netting with the temperature up to 110. We went 5 and 6 days at a time without baths—covered with layers and layers of gummy mosquito repellent. With five layers of that stuff on, we began to repel each other."

The mud and the mosquito repellent washed off, but the anecdotes came home with them—including a few awkward moments.

After a show in New Delhi, India, the troupe released hundreds of red, white, and blue peace and friendship balloons.

The peace balloons caused a brawl in the second row. An Indian belted the American next to him and shouted: "He took my balloon." Joey took them both backstage and gave each his own balloon.

The performers had been warned it was not good manners to touch royalty unless the royal person extended his hand first. In Afghanistan, a dancer was introduced to the crown prince. "It's a pleasure," said the hooper. "I hope we get to play your country some day."

"This is his country," whispered Joey. The dancer was effusively apologetic. He slapped the prince on the back vigorously—and repeatedly. "Aw, prince boy, I'm sorry," he said. The prince, well, he was a prince about the whole thing.

This actually happened, too: In Jakarta, Indonesia, the musicians' instruments arrived 4 hours late. Joey drew liberally from his years in show business for a challenge round of jokes which filled the time.

His comic opponent—who also chipped in by singing Negro spirituals—was Indonesian President Sukarno.

The Adams troupe included Buddy Rich and his Jazz Sextet, the Four Step Brothers, a dance team; fire-eater and clown Chaz Chase, magician Celeste Evans, John Shirley, and Bonnie Dale, who make animals out of balloons; the Sylve Sisters, a singing trio, and Jerry Bell, stage manager.

Joey Adams calls them "entertainers in striped pants." He'd like to see many other teams of entertainers follow, and, as president of the American Guild of Variety Artists, he's going to work for it.

The trip might be compared to one of the many "industrial" that perform in this country. But here the sponsor was the United States, and the commercial: "Let's be friends." Joey thinks the customers in Asia went for it in a big way.

IT'S A GOING U.S. BUSINESS

The Joey Adams tour is just one example of the State Department's recognition that there's no business like show business for helping to thaw the cold war and representing this country overseas.

The Government's program of letting audiences on both sides of the Iron Curtain—and some in countries straddling it—see American dramatic, musical, variety, and athletic entertainment has been in operation for 8 years now.

Its budget runs to about \$9 million a year and covers international trade fair exhibits and labor missions abroad, as well as artistic and athletic presentations. Last year about \$3 million was allocated for the latter phase, consisting of 43 projects.

Despite this modest budget, the program of cultural presentations has run into some tough times at hearings from congressional critics.

Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, thinks the program is important and should be expanded. While our presentation program has been constant, Mr. Murrow said, Communist countries in the past 2 years have stepped up theirs.

"We have the talent to match their achievements," said the head of the USIA, "whether it be in the field of athletics, ballet, opera or acrobats. But we must send our talent abroad where it can be seen and heard."

Cultural exchange is even seen as valuable with our cold war opponents, the Soviets. Under the recently concluded agreement with the Russians, the Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra will perform at the Lincoln Center in October, and then in many other cities, while the Robert Shaw Choral and Orchestra will go to the Soviet Union.

Among others who will perform in the Soviet Union under the cultural exchange agreement are opera singer Dorothy Kirsten and pianist Grant Johannesen.

The 1962 worldwide trek of American entertainers has already started with four shows on the road and six more scheduled. The Baird Marionettes are in southeast Asia; the Eastman Philharmonia is in Germany and will go to Poland and Russia; the Tappas Dance Company is in Africa; and soprano Camilla Williams is en route to the Far East.

Others set to go include the Ailey Dance Theater, a 17-member modern dance group, headed for the Far East and Australia; the Paul Winter Sextet, a jazz outfit, South and Central America; the Astor String Quartet, classical music, southern Europe and Iran; the University of Maine Theater Group, India and Pakistan; the Chad Mitchell Trio, Central America; and the Berea College Dancers, Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, other leading American newspapers gave wide coverage to the

tour. Typical is the following article which appeared in the New York Times on September 8:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1961]
JOEY ADAMS TROUPE BRINGS JOY TO NEPAL ON A 3-DAY VISIT

KATMANDU, NEPAL, September 8.—The 3-day visit here of Joey Adams and his troupe as part of President Kennedy's special international program for cultural relations has been a great success. Such was the demand for the tickets that an extra performance was arranged.

The party brought something new to Nepal, and the large audiences at the four scheduled shows reacted with full-throated approval.

But the show that touched the people's hearts was on the roadside, in the suburbs of Katmandu. Here crowds gathered and children gaped in wide-eyed joy.

They saw tap dancers, a woman magician who brought beauty and color to her show, a man and a woman with balloons and a comedian.

At schools where the troupe performed children laughed with glee and stampeded to catch hold of the balloons. Among the schools visited were St. Xavier's, run by the Reverend Marshall D. Moran, of Chicago and St. Mary's Convent.

In Bir Hospital here, members of the troupe went through the wards to entertain the patients.

Impressions of the show varied. "I liked the drumbeats," a tax driver said.

"I bet I could do it," a schoolboy said after seeing the tap dancers.

"We also have magicians, but not such lovely ones," said a farmer.

This international experiment to create good will between nations can be considered a success. While the Nepalese were impressed, the troupe was no less impressed by the local people. "We had an intelligent audience. The children are cute," they said.

Representatives of our Government abroad hailed Adams and his company for their invaluable contribution to good will and the bettering of our international relations. Typical of the many complimentary letters Adams received are:

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,

Kabul, Afghanistan, September 30, 1961.

Mr. JOEY ADAMS,

Joey Adams Variety Group, c/o U.S. Information Service, American Consulate General, Singapore, Malaya.

DEAR JOEY: Nearly a month has passed since you and your variety group were in Kabul, a month that has been filled for you with travel to several other countries far from home. I am sure that you must find these visits a rewarding experience, for you all give so generously of your talents and friendship that you must in return feel the warm appreciation that your audiences and hosts extend to you.

The visit of your group to Kabul was memorable, both for us in the American community and for the approximately 90,000 people of Afghanistan who came and came again to enjoy your show at the Jeshyn Fair. As you know, appearances of American artists and entertainers in Afghanistan are few and far between. Kabul is a long way from the Orpheum-Pantages circuit, and only a few Afghans have had any opportunity to see our really good American artists perform. That they like American entertainment is beyond question. That so many could see such

fine and varied American entertainment here in Kabul will provide a topic of local conversation for a long time to come. There is no doubt that the Joey Adams Variety Show was the outstanding single attraction at the 1961 Jeshyn Fair.

Beyond entertaining your audiences in Kabul, you and the members of your group went out of your way to meet people on the streets and in the bazaars, generating good will by your gestures of friendliness. I particularly appreciated your willingness to perform, and perform often, under conditions that were unfamiliar and probably sometimes distracting.

The American community will not soon forget your group. During the nearly 2 weeks that you were here you literally changed our way of life, which was no small accomplishment in itself. That you also left many friends among your countrymen in Kabul, friends who will long remember you and what you did here, is equally apparent and more important.

On behalf of all of my staff as well as myself and Mrs. Byroade, I want to thank you all again for a job well done. I hope you will see that each member of your group knows of my feelings as expressed herein—for it applies to every member of the troupe.

With all good wishes for the remainder of your tour—and always.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. BYROADE,
Ambassador.

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Vientiane, Laos, October 11, 1961.

Mr. JOEY ADAMS,
Hotel Sathia Palace,
Vientiane.

DEAR JOEY ADAMS: I wish to thank you very warmly on behalf of all of us here for the fine work which you and your troupe have done in Laos.

We and the Lao have very much appreciated your willingness to give so many extra performances in addition to those regularly scheduled. Your visits to hospitals, schools, and other places have brought much pleasure and satisfaction. You have all certainly worked very hard here and deserve much credit for the good results.

You would be pleased to hear the nice things that have been said about you by the Lao, including the Prime Minister.

Please express my appreciation and thanks to all of your troupe.

Very sincerely yours,

WINTHROP G. BROWN,
American Ambassador.

[Telegram]

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
October 16, 1961.

Joey Adams show breaking all records here with complete sellout sports hall for 4 nights: total attendance 40,000 people.

Near crisis developed night after arrival when instruments and equipment failed to arrive from Bangkok in time for scheduled show before President Sukarno at Bogor Palace to which entire cabinet, members diplomatic corps and other top-drawer guests had been invited. Group was kept waiting from 7 to 9 p.m. Plane with equipment touched down at Kemajoran Airport at 7:30 p.m. where USIS had truck and driver waiting. With palace cooperation, truck was given motorcycle escort 40 miles to Bogor, certainly first time in history jazz orchestra has been so honored in Indonesia where rock and roll taboo.

Sukarno played the gracious host, displaying no impatience at delay and Adams skill-

fully exploited incident so that show was outstanding success.

Opening night at sports hall excited spectators began to arrive at 6 o'clock for 8 o'clock show. By the time I reached hall, shortly before 8, everyone was in his seat. First Minister Leimena, sitting next to me said, "If price of rice goes up, we're likely to have riots in Djakarta. But if the price of tickets to Joey Adams goes up, everybody would pay without complaint." Performers gave all they had and show was received with high enthusiasm.

HOWARD P. JONES,
Ambassador to Indonesia.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
November 13, 1961.

Mr. JOEY ADAMS,
Oceanic Hotel,
Madrae.

DEAR JOEY AND CINDY: (I hope the billing is right.) I thought you might like to know that the "Joey Adams Show" was the biggest financial success we have had in Bangalore in my more than 4 years here. It was more than merely a financial success, however. Among the people we really wanted to reach it was also a thumping artistic success. Had we been able to get the hall for another night we could easily have filled it again.

You realize of course that while the show is the thing, there is also a total image which a group of prominent visiting Americans creates when traveling abroad. They are observed carefully, and their behavior is discussed over coffee for months afterward. In this department, too, your group scored very high, certainly higher than any large group I've had in Bangalore.

Bami called me a few minutes ago and remarked that "These are the kind of Americans we like to meet, warm and genuine." Having met her you understand why I have so high a regard for her opinion.

Elsie and I want to thank you for everything you've done for us. You will be remembered long and affectionately not only by us but by thousands of my fellow citizens of Bangalore.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. NORMA,
Public Affairs Officer.

P.S.—Enclosed are a couple of clippings: more later.

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Singapore, October 25, 1961.

JOEY ADAMS, Esq.,
Joey Adams All Star Show.

DEAR JOEY: On behalf of all members of the Consulate General may I express warm and heartfelt thanks to you and the members of your troupe for doing such a splendid job in promoting good will for our country in the State of Singapore. Moreover, I am sure that members of the American community share this view.

Your philosophy of love and laughter was exemplified by your activities and contacts here. It is difficult to imagine how any individual or any group of individuals could do more to carry out these qualities so much needed in the world today.

Please convey our grateful appreciation to all members of the Joey Adams All Star Show. May I also take this opportunity to say how much personally my wife and I enjoyed meeting and talking with all of you.

The very best of luck to you in your coming travels, and every good wish for continued success.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT DOMBAUSER,
Counsel in Charge.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Saigon, Vietnam, November 8, 1961.

Mr. JOEY ADAMS,
Director, Joey Adams Variety Show,
Hotel Caravelle, Saigon.

DEAR Mr. ADAMS: Before your departure, I want to send you in writing what I have had the opportunity to say to you personally on several occasions—that I appreciate most sincerely the contribution which you and the members of the variety show have made, not only to the food relief fund, but even more importantly to the cause of United States-Vietnamese relations. From all reports I have, and from personal observation, your week's stay here has helped to bring cheer to a hard-pressed people and to give them a real feeling of America's sincerity and warmhearted support.

Frankly, as I told you, I was skeptical at first as to whether the variety show would fit the situation in Vietnam at the present time, which is one of national emergency bordering on wartime conditions. You were quick to appreciate this, and by your performances in hospitals, orphanages, and other informal appearances you created the right atmosphere and reactions.

I would like, through you, to extend both my personal and official thanks to all the members of your troupe, and to wish you all continued success in this good enterprise.

I shall send a copy of this letter to the Director of the President's Entertainment Fund in Washington.

My wife joins me in best regards to you and to Mrs. Adams—and thanks again for your book, which has already made us chuckle.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK E. NOLTING, Jr.,
American Ambassador.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Bombay, India, December 5, 1961.

Mr. JOEY ADAMS,
Care of U.S. Information Service,
New Delhi, India.

DEAR JOEY: May I offer my congratulations to you and to the members of your troupe for the successful performances which were staged in Bombay. As we know, there was standing room only the last few days, attesting to the popularity of the show with the people of Bombay.

I was especially impressed by the performances which members of your group gave at hospitals, children's homes and at the beggars' home here. This was most commendable and greatly appreciated.

Both my wife and I were happy to have the opportunity of becoming acquainted with you and Cindy, as well as Jed Hornen, and of meeting the other members of your group.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. CARR,
American Consul General.

GENERAL REACTIONS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN
SERVICE POSTS TO THE JOEY ADAMS VARIETY SHOW

From Bombay, India: "Adams show still smash sellout and gone to standing room only. Charity performances, publicity, going very well. Joey, Cindy and group quite cooperative."

From Djakarta, Indonesia: "Joey Adams breaking all records here with complete sell-out sports hall for 4 night: Total attendance, 40,000 people."

From Kabul, Afghanistan: "Embassy in Kabul reports that Jeshyn Fair formally

opened morning of August 24. Variety show performed evening August 23. Americans tremendous success and stole show."

From Katmandu, Nepal: "Comments from all sources regarding Joey Adams show regard it highly laudatory, and there have been expressions of regret on part of Nepalis who were unable to purchase tickets."

From Saigon, Vietnam: "Embassy highly pleased with success of Joey Adams Variety Show as contribution to Vietnamese-American relations. Show itself and Adams' personal gift of cementing United States-Vietnam relations most impressive. In addition to eight capacity performances for flood relief which widely publicized all media, Adams troupe generated widespread community good will by additional performances for war-wounded Vietnamese soldiers, orphans, Scout jamboree."

From Singapore: "Joey Adams show Singapore visit highly successful every angle. Adams, wife Cindy, Buddy Rich, cast, enthusiastically feted by sponsoring Jaycees, Singapore musicians, alumni group, local citizens schooled in U.S. American community. Two public performances completely sold out 3 days before play date. Additional charity children's show packed. All appearances helpful promoting American friendship. Press, radio coverage outstanding, effective, from airport reception throughout stay. Joey, Cindy both did excellent radio programs, made hit on air, stage, using Malay appropriately. Shows received good notices: 'fun-loving, spirited, wholesome, nonstop laughter and cheering, America's salesmen had done a good job.' 'Joey, Shirleys, Chase visit to orthopedic hospital hit front page southeast Asia's largest English language newspaper with five column human interest picture Joey, one of the children. Joey, singers, visited School for Blind. Company cooperative with CG staff, Jaycees, appreciative efficient programming job. Management, crews tackled job intelligently, worked smoothly with sponsors. Adams earned kudos from Jaycees, public.'"

From Vientiane, Laos: "Joey Adams show extremely well received Vientiane in four major performances plus special appearances hospitals, schools. Prime Minister invited troupe buffet supper with Lao entertainment."

Beyond this, Mr. Adams and his colleagues were hailed by official representatives of the countries in which his troupe entertained. They were extremely vocal in their praise and thanks. Just a few of these letters, Mr. Speaker, are offered here:

UDORNTHANI CHANGWAD HOSPITAL,
October 4, 1961.

HON. Mr. KENNETH TODD YOUNG,
The American Ambassador,
Bangkok, Thailand.

SIR: As director of the Udorn Hospital and as a doctor, I want to express my appreciation for the good will which was brought to Udorn and the financial assistance given to the hospital as a result of the Joey Adams Variety Show's visit to Udornthani.

The first show given by the variety group on September 19, 1961, was a charity performance for the benefit of the hospital. The total proceeds were presented to the acting governor for the hospital that evening, amounting to \$20,354. This money will be used for the purchase of new operating equipment to be placed in the new wing of the hospital.

Mr. Adams, accompanied by Mrs. Murchie, wife of our USIS Director, personally visited the hospital and toured the various wards

of adult and children patients. Mr. Adams stopped at each bed to give a smile and a "wai" to the patient. His personal touch was greatly appreciated by everyone. Although but few patients could understand Mr. Adams' words, they all could understand his entertaining personality and friendly smile.

It is my intention to place a metal plaque in the new wing of the hospital, when it is completed, which will carry the following inscription: "The Joey Adams Variety Show, as a sign of Thai-American friendship, donated to the Udon Changwad Hospital \$20,354, September 19, 1961."

Again let me thank Your Excellency, USIS Udon and the Joey Adams Variety Show for aiding our Changwad Hospital and for displaying a spirit of Thai and American friendship which will long be remembered by the people of Udon.

Sincerely yours,

KASEM CHIATAYASOTHORN,
Director.

REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM,
ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM,
CONG-HOA GENERAL HOSPITAL.

Mr. JOEY ADAMS,
Majestic Hotel,
Saigon, Vietnam.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: On November 3, 1961, you and your troop of entertainers performed a series of acts for the patients of this hospital. These acts were done so well and show the great amount of time, effort, and affection for the audience which all of you placed on this show.

You have brought into the hearts of these Vietnamese fighters for freedom, a measure of cheer and that they are remembered by the people of the free world.

The patients and staff of this hospital want to thank you and your troop for this fine show of humaneness.

We wish you and your troop will have always good success everywhere in the world.

Lt. Col. VU NGOC HOAN, MC,
Cong-Hoa General Hospital Commander.

SINGAPORE JUNIOR
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 10, 1961.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and all the members of your all-star variety show for the tremendous success of your recent visit to Singapore. I can assure you that it has been by far the most successful of all the shows which we have had the pleasure of sponsoring.

Quite apart from the two public performances, which were completely sold out and enabled us to raise a considerable sum for our scholarship and welfare funds, we have had letters of appreciation from many of the groups of underprivileged children, who attended the special children's matinee, as well as letters of thanks from the Singapore School for the Blind and the St. Andrew's Mission Hospital for the visits by yourself and members of your troupe.

Last but not least, we would like to place on record our gratitude for your ready co-operation throughout your brief stay here and the very happy and cordial relationship which existed during that time between the members of your troupe and the members of our organization.

Your visit was a perfect example of international harmony and good will. We wish you every success for the remainder of your tour and we hope that many of you will visit Singapore again some day so that we can renew our friendship.

Please convey the very best wishes of all the members of the Singapore Junior Chamber of Commerce to Buddy Rich and his band, Celeste Evans, the Sylvia Sisters, the

Step Brothers, John Shirley and Bonnie, Chaz Chase, and to your charming wife Cindy and yourself.

Yours sincerely,

RONALD CHANG,
Acting President.

REMARKS OF THE HEAD OF NATIONAL ORPHANAGE IN SAIGON

Ladies, gentlemen, how glad we have been in enjoying your very good performances. Coming from a distant country, you have kindness to get here, our national orphanage, in order to give us, the miserable orphan children, many minutes of entertainments.

We can say that you have brought a bright light of the culture of your country and a new movement of stimulating the desire of arts and sciences to the Vietnamese people and specially to the Vietnamese children.

Being compared to you, famous artists, famous actors and actresses, we are only the unexperienced players, making first steps in arts. But in order to answer to your benevolence, let us perform some national folk-dances. We hope they will be able to say you some Vietnamese characteristics and to offer you some ideas of Vietnamese culture.

REMARKS OF A YOUNG VIETNAMESE THANKING THE ADAMS' TROUPE

Ladies, gentlemen, on the occasion of your friendship trip to Vietnam, you have reserved a nice show to our national orphanage, it is a great benefit, a precious gift that comforts us very much.

In this free world, the United States of America have given a good example on equality and friendship to many countries. Living in a distant country, you have had to cross ocean and pass thousands of miles to reach our country. After many difficulties, you have come to our dear country to share her joy as well as her sorrow. In this occasion, we think that you, the artists of "The Joey Adams Variety Show," have been able to accomplish an important task in strengthening the ties between the United States of America and Vietnam.

And today, you pay attention to these orphan children, visiting us and giving us a show to amuse us and make us joyful, to stimulate us and encourage us. How happy we are. We are now anxious to enjoy your performance.

What can we say to thank you of what you'll do for us today? We feel very happy in front of our dear benefactors. Let us have pleasure to present you our warmest feelings of thanks, and, please transfer our respectful gratitude to the Government and to the people of the United States of America. We wish the amity and cultural relations between the two peoples get more and more tied.

At last, we wish you good success in your friendship traveling in order to be able to develop arts, culture, and civilization of your fatherland to all countries in the whole world.

The press in these countries, too, noted the fine objectives of the tour and the tremendous good will it fostered. It lavished praise on the mission. I call just a few of these accounts to the attention of this House and the American people, for they are positive proof of the inestimable value of such a tour and point up to the need for our Government to sponsor additional similar missions.

[News story which appeared in a Saigon newspaper]

ADAMS TROUPE ENTERTAINS WOUNDED SOLDIERS

Vietnamese Republican Army soldiers recovering from wounds suffered in recent

combat with the Viet Cong, including some who had participated in Wednesday's major battle in Phuoc Thanh Province, were enthusiastic in their reception of the Joey Adams Variety Show put on for their special benefit at the Cong Hoa General Hospital in Go Vap near Saigon on Friday afternoon.

The Adams troupe, on tour in Asia under sponsorship of the U.S. State Department's President's Fund, are currently presenting eight shows at the Hung Dao Theater in Saigon the proceeds of which will be donated to the relief of victims of the flood disaster in the Makong Delta.

The show opened Thursday night before an overflowing audience of some 1,700 who were delighted with the vibrant, fast moving show. A few tickets are still available at the Hung Dao Theater for the remaining performances.

Friday Joey Adams told the Vietnamese fighters for freedom that Americans have fought for years for the same great purpose to which the Vietnamese Republic Forces are dedicated—Independence and human dignity.

"We are here," America's good-will entertainer told the soldiers and their families visiting them, "to show the friendship and love of the American people for the people of Vietnam. Since you could not come to the theater to see the show, we have brought it to you." The smiles, laughter, and cheers which followed the performances in the wards and the hospital's theater by Adams and his group gave ample evidence of the soldiers' appreciation of the entertainers' efforts.

The Joey Adams troupe was virtually every minute of their spare time in Saigon solidly booked for appearances in hospitals and orphanages. The show will leave Saigon next Wednesday for India.

[Article from New Delhi newspaper]
GOOD AMERICAN ENTERTAINMENT
(By Our Drama Critic)

It is difficult to beat the Americans in the show business. Mr. Joey Adams' all-star show, which opened on Monday night at the Industries Fair theater, is slick, entertaining, amusing, clever and charming. It gives 2 hours of very good variety, and never a dull moment.

Mr. Adams is the compere or master of ceremonies, and he keeps up a patter most of the time he is on the stage. Occasionally he joins in the dance to prove that he was the teacher of all his dancers.

The band is a lively lot of musicians, playing with obvious gusto, and their hot jazz is going to give heart throbs to the jazz crazy. One of their interesting items is a number played on a vibraphone, a pleasant sounding instrument of metal plates with resonance tubes suspended from the table. It is played somewhat like a gypsy cymbalom.

Probably the most outstanding in her own class is Miss Celeste Evans, a Canadian girl magician, whose tricks are excellent; handkerchiefs turn into pigeons at a flick of a finger, and cards pop up at her command. And there is a pretty finale to her act, when, against a dark stage, her kerchiefs and pigeons turn luminescent and fly about in weird colors. This number alone would make a visit to this show worth while.

Deanna, Deanda, and Joan, the Sylte Sisters, sing prettily and are clever at imitating other singing groups such as the Anderson Sisters.

The Four Step Brothers are tap dancers (their names are Williams, Macdonald, Spencer and Anderson) and offer a great variety of tap dancing, in a large number of rhythms. Their agility is remarkable and in India, where rhythm is so important an element of music, their tapping will please

many. They can also sing ("When saints go marchin' in") and crack jokes.

All this is great fun, but it is difficult to beat the dumb comedian, Mr. Chaz Chase, who never says a word and keeps you spell-bound with his hilarious mime. He eats burning cigars, cigarettes, packets of flaming matches, his own shirt front, flowers and all, and is just about to eat Mr. Adams well salted, when he is chased off the stage.

Mr. John Shirley and his wife, Bonnie, do wonders with balloons, hundreds of them. A delightful and original number, this would delight all children from 8 to 80.

Altogether, very good entertainment. Every night at 8:30 p.m. up to Sunday, December 10, at the Industries Fair theater.

[From the Times of Vietnam, Nov. 3, 1961]
JOEY ADAMS VARIETY SHOW OPENING NIGHT PERFORMANCE

SAIGON, November 3.—"Wonderful" was among the words of praise from spectators who attended the gala opening performance of Joey Adams' variety show at the Hung Dao Theater here last night.

The show was the first of a series of 8 the 21-member troupe of American entertainers is scheduled to present for the benefit of Vietnamese flood victims. The troupe arrived Wednesday, under the sponsorship of the President's Fund for Cultural Exchange.

Presiding at the first night gala was Mrs. Truong Vinh Le, wife of the National Assembly chairman.

The troupe opened before a large and enthusiastic audience with a program featuring American songs, jazz music and many variety numbers. Buddy Rich, world famous drummer, dominated the show with his skill, the equal of which has never been seen here before, as one spectator put it.

The singing Sylve Sisters, the four acrobatic-dancing Step Brothers, the balloon artists, Mr. Shirley and Bonnie, the slender blond magician, Celeste Evans, and Chaz Chase, the clown, all brought repeated and deafening cheers from the audience.

To the obvious delight of everyone, noted Vietnamese crooner Tran Van Trach also appeared on the show, alone and with troupe leader Joey Adams. Adams added fun to the atmosphere and made it truly friendly with his jokes and, particularly his quickly learned Vietnamese—"toi la thay" (I am the teacher).

Mr. Adams and his wife, Cindy, earlier introduced their troupe in Vietnamese.

[Article from New Delhi newspaper]
NINETY MINUTES OF SHEER FUN—ALL-STAR SHOW OF JOEY ADAMS
(By Our Music Critic)

NEW DELHI, December 4.—Joey Adams' "All-Star Show" which opened this evening at the Industries Fair theater for a week-long run, is an hour and a half of rollicking entertainment—the best, perhaps, to come this way since quite some time. Here are no pretensions to purpose and meanings; Adams with the others in his show have a go at the blues with hammer, tongs, pick and shovel, and by the time they are through, the hall is all in shambles, splitting and spilling over with laughter and gaiety.

Adams can surely count on the cheering and applause as long as he is here performing.

The bill of Adams' All-Star Show is made up of popular songs by one of America's top singing teams, the youthful Sylve Sisters trio; some absolutely fabulous tap dancing by the renowned Step Brothers; moving clowning by Chaz Chase; neat magic by the glamorous Celeste Evans; a balloon (hundreds of them) act by John Shirley and

Bonnie in which the audience also join in. All this against a backdrop of delightful jazz by Mike Manieri and his band. Joe Adams himself acts as master of ceremonies, a role in which he not only joins with each of his stars in his or her act, but also has the audience splitting with laughter at his clever gags.

FUN FOR ALL

There is something for everyone in the show. For jazz fans there is both traditional dixieland as well as progressive jazz. The Step Brothers more than prove their virtuosity tapping and clicking their soles through half a dozen or so numbers. Celeste Evans is remarkably neat at her magic and clown (pantomimist, really), Chaz Chase manages to elicit more than just laughter.

There are some very moving undertones in his speechless act in which the feigned indifference he munches his way through the proverbial daisies to his own collar and another's hat. It is difficult to know whether Adams has intended it so, but his gags do strike one as being some sort of a mirror to a cliché ridden cliché tied way of life. One can even imagine Mr. Adams revolving around the all powerful cliché.

[From the Times of Vietnam, November 1961]

JOEY ADAMS PLEDGES SUPPORT FOR FLOOD RELIEF

Joey Adams and his troupe of American entertainers arrived Tuesday at Tan Son Nhut Airport and expressed their sincere desire to contribute in any way they can as good will emissaries to Vietnam.

The group has already agreed to appear at hospitals and orphanages in their spare time.

Under sponsorship of the U.S. State Department's President's Fund, Adams and his troupe of 21 artists will present 8 shows at the Hung Dao Theater. A gala formal opening took place last night.

Proceeds of all performances will be donated to disaster victims in the Mekong Delta.

"We are aware of President Diem's recent emergency declaration and want to express our eagerness to help in any way we can," said Adams upon his arrival from Hong Kong yesterday.

Fresh from successes in Djakarta, Bangkok, Singapore, Vientiane, Phnom Penh, and other points in the Far East, Adams expressed enthusiasm over the warmth of Asian audiences everywhere.

Accompanying Adams was his comedienne wife, Cindy; the singing Sylve Sisters; the acrobatic-dancing Step Brothers; Celeste Evans, magician; Chaz Chase, pantomimist; and the balloon artists, Bonnie and Shirley.

Members of Vietnamese theater circles, including Star Comedian Tran Van Trach, who will appear on the show, made their acquaintance with Adams and his troupers Tuesday night at a reception held at the Vietnamese-American Association villa.

Tickets for all performances will be sold at the Hung Dao Theater.

The American Guild of Variety Artists is indeed fortunate to have Mr. Adams as their president. This organization's publication gave a full and detailed accounting of the tour. The following two articles graphically bear out that this is a man who literally carries out his words by his deeds.

A STUDY IN LAUGHTER

American Showman Joey Adams entered the St. Andrew's Orthopaedic Hospital in Bedok here today "all ready to jazz 'em up" with his wisecracks and tricks.

But before he could get started, the little boys and girls greeted him with a cheerful chorus of: "Good morning, Uncle Adams. Welcome to our home." They were all smiling too—despite their infirmities.

And for the next hour, there was nonstop laughter in the home for crippled children as Adams told his funny stories, and Chaz Chase swallowed matches, cigarettes, and anything he could lay his hands on, and John and Bonnie Shirley, the husband and wife team, gave a dazzling balloon show.

At the end of it all, Mr. Adams said: "I have been to a good many hospitals all over the world, but they all seemed to give me a depressed feeling, except this one. There they are all so full of joy. Before I could cheer them up, they had already cheered me up. These kids are physically handicapped, all of them. Yet they have found happiness. How many people in the world are plagued with unhappiness although they are physically fit?"

Mr. Adams said his one regret was that he did not bring his whole troupe to the hospital today.

But he made this promise as he went from bed to bed: "We'll send you gifts when we return to America."

Later Mr. Adams and his entertainers visited the Home for the Blind in Thomson Road to cheer up the inmates there. The Joey Adams All-Star Variety Show will give a matinee show for more than 800 underprivileged children at the Victoria Theater tomorrow.

VAUDEVILLE TROUPE RETURNS FROM STATE DEPARTMENT ASIAN TOUR

The Joey Adams Variety Show has returned to the United States from a State Department tour of the Far East which showed that variety performers are among the best ambassadors of good will to people of other nations.

The troupe consisted of Joey and Cindy Adams, Chaz Chase, the Sylve Sisters, the Four Step Brothers, John Shirley and Bonnie, Celeste Evans, and the Buddy Rich Combo. They were received by heads of state in every country they visited, but more important were the shows given to the general public, many for local charities. In addition, members of the troupe visited hospitals and other institutions to bring happiness to children and to the sick.

JOEY ADAMS GOOD WILL SHOW HAILED IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The Joey Adams Variety Show, under the sponsorship of the U.S. State Department, has been entertaining audiences throughout southern and southeast Asia to critical acclaim, and the gratitude of those who have seen American variety artists for the first time.

The troupe has played in such countries as Afghanistan, Nepal, Cambodia, Thailand, Laos, and the State of Hong Kong. Audiences have ranged from groups of youngsters in small, out-of-the-way villages, to command performances before royalty.

In addition to Joey Adams, and wife Cindy, the troupe consists of the well-known pantomimist Chaz Chase, the singing Sylve Sisters, the dancing Step Brothers, John Shirley and Bonnie's balloon act, and Magician Celeste Evans; together with Drummer Buddy Rich and his combo consisting of Mike Manieri, Rolf Ericson, Sam Most, Wyatt Ruther and John Morris.

In a letter quoted by Columnist Robert Coleman in the New York News, Joey writes: "Our stages are often put up in the forest or on steps of temples. We sometimes make up with insect repellent, and do without baths because the water and electricity are

off. We have waded knee-high through morasses to get to impromptu stages, but our reward has been robust applause from those we have reached with such difficulty. And the enjoyment of our audiences seems to tell us that we are gaining friends for America and building a worldwide following for vaudeville."

Joey is quoted by Columnist Nick Kenny in the same publication as saying, in part, "Down through the years, whenever there was tension, court jesters or the minstrels were called in to relieve the fever. I hope we've done that on this trip. We've played hospitals and schools, taught the children the crafts of show business, played for the armies, entertained the people and appeared at command performances for kings and queens of half a dozen countries. Every friend that we have won for our country has brought us nearer to peace and further away from the martial music and Khrushchev and his band. The password has been love. I've heard about the signs saying, 'Americans Go Home'; I can only tell you they have welcomed us with open arms and hearts."

Members of the troupe turned to teaching in Laos, to help in areas where the American wives, who had been teaching, were evacuated. Paul Johnson, director of the Lao-American Association wrote Joey, "Thanks from all of us for a fine all-round and greatly appreciated show, the likes of which has never been seen here in Laos before. It had something for everybody, the Lao especially, and including the 'League of Nations' stationed here in the various embassy and government positions. Let's not forget the ICC too. The Lao Army and public show that was extra was a big hit and Colonel Boonkhong is still talking of its success."

"For my part, please give special thanks to Cindy, your charming pedagogic wife, Mrs. Chase, and Mr. Prince Spencer for their fine, helpful teaching chores at the Lao-American Association. The local students greatly enjoyed their teaching and send their respectful and gracious regards. With the teaching situation being a bit tenuous, due to American wives not being available due to evacuation 14 months ago, their stints before the classes were much more valuable than ordinarily would be the case. Give them all our lasting thanks."

Howard P. Jones, U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia, writes: "This is to thank you both and the fine people who were with you for the contribution you made during your week's stay in Djakarta. Since your departure, I have heard many Indonesians say with real regret that you not only should have stayed longer but that people in other parts of the country should also have had an opportunity to see your show. This is the sincerest compliment an Indonesian can pay you—to want the rest of his people to enjoy the experience he himself had had."

"I hope you will pass on to the rest of your group too my appreciation for their patience and understanding, as well as for their superb performance. I know full well that they were not too comfortable at the hotel—I have stayed at hotels all over this country and know something about them—but I heard no word of complaint, even from the three lovely Sylte Sisters who I understand had to sleep in two single beds. Had there been a way to provide better accommodations for so large a group, you would have had them. I trust it will give all of your company satisfaction far exceeding the memory of any discomfort involved to know that they won the hearts of Indonesia and made a real contribution to American-Indonesian relations and to the understanding between our people that is so fundamental to progress in the right direc-

tion. I can only wish for you both and the rest of the troupe what I am certain is assured: continuation of the outstanding success that your show was here during the remainder of your travels."

Robert Donhauser, U.S. consul in Singapore, wrote: "On behalf of all members of the consulate general may I express warm and heartfelt thanks to you and the members of your troupe for doing such a splendid job in promoting good will for our country in the State of Singapore. Moreover, I am sure that members of the American community share this view."

"Your philosophy of love and laughter was exemplified by your activities and contacts here. It is difficult to imagine how any individual or any group of individuals could do more to carry out these qualities so much needed in the world today."

"Please convey our grateful appreciation to all members of the Joey Adams All Star Show. May I also take this opportunity to say how much personally my wife and I enjoyed meeting and talking with all of you."

"The very best of luck to you in your coming travels, and every good wish for continued success."

Mr. Speaker, I cite the above articles and documents as but typical of those written about and to Joey Adams and his good will mission. They clearly illustrate the success of the project and reflect due tribute to the man who made it possible.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Joey Adams is a great American. His contribution to our foreign prestige is inimitable and invaluable. I know I speak for this Congress and the American people when I say "Hats off to Joey Adams and his Ambassadors of Good Will."

THE DOUBTING PUBLIC

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the record high volume of mail being received by Members of the Congress from anxious citizens is only one of many indications the American public increasingly questions the adequacy of current U.S. policies in dealing with Khrushchev and the Communist menace in general. When people lack confidence in one branch of our Government, the pattern is for them to turn to another for strength and protection of their heritage. These public doubts have mounted with such events as Cuba, Berlin, Laos, Soviet test resumption and the President's delayed, equivocal and agonized response to it.

Both the President and the Vice President have implied from time to time that such public doubts play into Communist hands; that they spring from two primary sources: the Communists who inspire them deliberately and from internal extremists of the right who they claim make irresponsible charges that disturb the public. In a Florida speech

last fall Mr. JOHNSON argued that if the American public would look at the situation through Communist eyes it would see that the Communists cannot win militarily or economically and that they must, therefore, conceive their most effective tactic as one of sowing doubts among the American people about national leaders and institutions for the purpose of weakening our strength at a crucial time. The Johnson-Kennedy thesis appears to be that American citizens are the most vulnerable element of American strength, therefore they are the primary Soviet target because doubts by the American public weaken America. Further, that Americans who make charges against the administration, responsible or irresponsible, are playing the Soviet game.

One may challenge both these conclusions.

Take first the effect of public doubts about national leaders and institutions. The American people have doubted their leaders and institutions many times in the past. One of the first such doubts caused the American Revolution. Historically, since then, recurring doubts have brought positive corrective action. They have not sapped the national strength. In the case of big business and questionable business ethics, public doubts brought antitrust laws, insurance and stock market regulations. Recent labor legislation is a product of public loss of confidence in certain labor leaders and institutions. Judicial agencies have changed in response to public questioning. Political leaders often have changed their ways or disappeared from the scene for similar reasons. Perhaps the Vice President has forgotten all this. He says the American public is the most vulnerable element of national strength. Could it be the national leadership which is vulnerable rather than the people?

Surely Soviet planners know that American leadership is a concentrated target, relatively small in number and very powerful, drawing heavily from intellectual and scientific groups for its membership. They also know that because of naivete or other factors many such people have been particularly susceptible to socialistic and disguised communistic theories and have played a major, if usually unwitting, part in the subjugation of almost every country now ruled by the Communists.

Soviet planners must also see that Americans have tended increasingly to elect their leaders on the basis of popularity and conformity which offends the fewest voters, rather than for individual qualities of courage, intelligence, forthrightness, or principle. They also must know that leaders so elected are, by their very nature, particularly susceptible to opinion pressures, much more so than is the average American who holds no elective office. The Soviets know their skills and tactics are particularly effective in generating opinion pressures throughout the world. They have watched American leaders demonstrate their sensitivity to such pressures on

many occasions and many issues. They also witness the avid intensity with which American political leaders follow and comment upon the Gallup poll's recurrent assessment of Presidential popularity.

Therefore, it seems logical and probable that Soviet planners regard our Government leadership rather than our people as the most vulnerable as well as important target.

There is indication that this, indeed, is the Soviet view; that consequently Soviet tactics are designed to force that leadership into foolishly trusting or appeasing by threats of violence or the pressures of world opinion. There also are some indications they may have been successful on various occasions; hence, perhaps spawning the public doubts which the President and Vice President seek to allay.

The Vice President has belittled the idea that the executive branch might harbor deliberate traitors or that illustrious Americans who have served the President could be duped.

Both logic and history deny these theories.

The Soviets undoubtedly have made intensive efforts to infiltrate the executive branch in view of its importance and vulnerability. The same may well be true for other branches of Government. They succeeded with Alger Hiss and several others. What has happened in the meantime to make Soviet efforts of this sort any less effective? No significant change is apparent. The FBI, though excellent, still is only human and therefore can still fail to detect all infiltrators as it has failed, on occasion, before. Other security apparatus of the Government makes no claims to absolute perfection. The Government can still fail to act on information furnished by the FBI or others, as it has before. Unwitting associates of deliberate infiltrators are probably no more alert than they ever were to the presence of such hidden enemies. It is therefore only logical to assume there are some deliberate infiltrators in high places, as there were before. In fact, the present administration climate is, in some ways, more in tune with socialistic and compromising tolerance than many of its predecessors, and therefore less likely to recognize an infiltrator who may press such views. Even should this not necessarily result, it does seem this administration should be acting more vigorously to assure the people that it does not.

In any event past experience indicates a cavalier, offhand attitude is not in order either regarding the dangers of infiltration, the problem of dupes or even the likelihood of serious miscalculations regarding Soviet intentions and tactics. Even the greatest men are not immune from mistakes. President Roosevelt called Stalin good old Joe. President Truman lost China to agrarian reformers and called anti-Communist sentiment a red herring. President Eisenhower imposed a 3-year moratorium on nuclear testing with no significant knowledge about relative nuclear capabilities or

probable Soviet cheating on the test ban. President Kennedy has already admitted publicly that the Soviets fooled him on nuclear testing.

The President and Vice President have said or implied that American extremists of the right are spreading doubts that weaken America. One might argue that positive, courageous, and intelligent national leadership or institutions need have no fear of whispering or extremist attacks. But when facts develop to support the charges, then leadership does need to worry.

One fact which might be used to judge such issues is whether or not past or existing national policies have stopped the Communist's advance. Most Americans do not think so. Study of the daily newspapers and the maps supports this negative conclusion. This, rather than extremist charges, well may be causing the growing doubts by the American public. Little will or can be done to erase those doubts until the President somehow satisfies the American people he has wrested the initiative from the Soviets.

In summary then, one can argue that public doubts amongst Americans are healthy rather than harmful; the primary Communist psychological target is the American Government, not the American people; serious doubts among the people arise from facts, not from the charges of extremists, though the latter may raise some of the issues and therefore serve a useful rather than a divisive purpose.

The temper of the American people is slowly changing from one of apathy and indifference to one of deep concern. This is healthy, not divisive.

Perhaps, in time, the President and the Vice President will recognize and do something about the basic elements of the problem, rather than pointing to side issues in an unsuccessful attempt to allay the public concern.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time that we set the record straight on the dairy price support program.

On March 7, 1962, a bipartisan coalition in the House Committee on Agriculture voted not to report House Joint Resolution 613 to the House. This legislation would have fixed the price support for manufacturing milk and butterfat for the 9-month period from April 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962, at \$3.40 per hundredweight—or 83 percent of parity, and 60.4 cents per pound, or 81 percent of parity, respectively. These levels of support were originally set by Secretary Freeman approximately 1

year ago under the authority of the Agricultural Act of 1949. This act provides that the Secretary may set dairy price supports at any level from 75 to 90 percent of parity as he finds necessary in order to assure an adequate supply.

At the end of 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation had in its inventory 66.3 million pounds of butter, 279.8 million pounds of dried milk, and no cheese. A year later on December 31, 1961, CCC had in its inventory 205.7 million pounds of butter, 354.9 million pounds of dried milk, and 59.7 million pounds of cheese.

Secretary Freeman's action in raising dairy price supports last March was taken in the face of rising national production of milk as was fully documented by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] on page 2698 of the RECORD of February 21, 1962. In March 1961 Mr. Freeman did not seem the least bit concerned with the words "in order to assure an adequate supply."

I think it is fair to say that this bill was introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in response to the President's message on agriculture of January 31, 1962, in which Mr. Kennedy stated:

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture is not authorized to set the price-support rate for milk above 75 percent of parity unless necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Under this law, in the present supply situation, the reduced support price must be announced for the marketing year beginning next April 1.

Therefore the administration contended that legislation was needed to prevent the current price supports from going back to the statutory minimum of 75 percent of parity.

The situation then boiled down to this: The Secretary tried to "pass the buck" to Congress by pushing for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 613, thus attempting to avoid his responsibility for his own self-imposed mistakes and problems. Rather than shoulder his rightful burden and exercise the authority he possessed under the law, Secretary Freeman asked Congress to rigidly fix dairy supports for three-quarters of the marketing year.

If nothing else, I submit that this is out of character for Mr. Freeman who last year asked for the virtual surrender of the legislative prerogatives of Congress in agricultural legislation, and who this year in the administration farm bill is asking for complete discretion to set dairy price supports from zero to 90 percent of parity under a permanent supply management production control plan.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the political masterminds of the New Frontier are now trying to castigate those who opposed this bill as being against the dairy farmer. In an obvious oversimplification of the issue, they are trying to equate a "no" vote on House Joint Resolution 613 as antifarmer, and a "yes" vote as profarmer. The fact is that such reasoning is simply not true and the American dairy farmer knows it.

In the first place, House Joint Resolution 613 did not exist in a vacuum. It was a vital part of the administration's long range dairy program set forth in H.R. 10010. It could not possibly be considered independently on its own merits because following closely on its heels is Mr. Freeman's plan to control the American dairy industry. Enactment of House Joint Resolution 613 would have led to increasing dairy purchases and soaring Government costs resulting in increased pressure for the control plan. Mr. Kennedy himself said in his agricultural message that the present level of support would result in Government expenditures of approximately \$500 million to support the prices of dairy products. In that same message, Mr. Kennedy stated that Government costs at the 75 percent of parity support level would be some \$440 million. Other informed observers in the Department of Agriculture have been quoted by the Wall Street Journal as estimating Government costs at the level established by House Joint Resolution 613 to be in excess of \$640 million in fiscal year 1963. In the Secretary's presentation before the committee, he submitted a cost estimate in the booklet "Food and Agriculture—A Program for the 1960's" on page 108 of the printed hearings as follows:

CCC expenditures in the current fiscal year will total approximately \$500 million and at present price-support levels would mount to more than \$600 million next year, in addition to about \$100 million each year for the special children's milk program. These heavy CCC costs subject the dairy price support program to serious jeopardy.

Thus, it can be seen that the enactment of House Joint Resolution 613 would have led to additional expenditures of some \$160 million (based on Mr. Freeman's own conservative estimates) over and above the tremendous sums now being spent.

I think it can also be fairly assumed that such fantastic expenditures would build up a terrific pressure for the Freeman control plan.

This is the plan, Mr. Speaker, that one of our leading farm organizations describes as follows:

The proposal to permit the sale or rental of milk bases means that these rights to produce milk would soon acquire a substantial cash value. As the milk bases changed hands over time, the cost of acquiring them would largely eliminate any temporary benefits that might be achieved under the program. It would no longer be possible for a young man to work into the dairy business by acquiring heifer calves and growing them to maturity. In addition to acquiring cows, he would have to find both the means of financing the purchase of a production base and someone willing to sell production rights.

It is the plan about which the National Milk Producers Federation says:

Surely it would be the height of folly to require American producers to submit to rigid production controls to reduce total supply and then permit imports to come in and replace our own production. Without effective import controls domestic production

could be rolled back without in any way reducing the surplus problem.

It is the plan which the Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency of Syracuse, N.Y., says:

We feel that this section as written allows the Secretary of Agriculture to virtually dictate what producers must do and that a referendum vote granted them would be as meaningless as a Russian election.

It is the plan that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] described on page 2554 of the RECORD of February 20, 1962, after a recent trip to his State as in serious trouble and the most revolutionary dairy proposal in many years.

It is the plan that calls for the imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary for up to 1 year or a \$2,000 fine, or both, for a dairy farmer who fails to keep proper books and records as determined by the Secretary. This is really the plan that the Committee on Agriculture rejected in part when it turned down House Joint Resolution 613.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the most shabby political gimmick in House Joint Resolution 613. The bill provides for only a 9-month freeze of dairy supports even though the marketing year for dairy products runs for a full 12 months to March 31, 1963. This clearly shows Mr. Freeman's intent to drop supports after the fall congressional elections. It was a crude political trick, to say the least. I commend my colleagues on the committee from both parties for their courage and statesmanship on this legislation for without a bipartisan effort, a great deal of unwise and unsound legislation would have been foisted on the American dairy farmer.

ATTACKS ON THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us are aware of the attacks that have been launched against the Un-American Activities Committee since its origin. These attacks vary in their nature and their intensity, but over the years they have never ceased.

I think it is important to deal seriously with these attacks for two reasons. We can always improve the techniques of the Congress and its committees and from time to time serious and constructive criticism lies in the attacks. By analyzing criticism to glean out the constructive features of it, though it be couched in the most virulent and unfair manner, to move to corrective action we defeat the basic purpose of those who

may be attacking not to improve but to destroy.

I have often observed that the Communists unwittingly have performed a service in our society through their technique of trying to exploit the social ills in our society. By calling attention to the social ill, albeit their purpose is to exploit it, they at the same time call our loyal peoples' attention to it. We then go ahead to correct it. I have thought this must be very frustrating to the Communists. I trust that our society will always preserve the mechanisms whereby we can correct social ills when attention is directed to them, by whomever directs our attention.

On November 20, 1961, I received a letter from the Missouri Council of Churches signed by Stanley I. Stuber, executive director, enclosing a copy of a resolution entitled "House Committee on Un-American Activities." I felt that this resolution was a vicious and unfair attack on both the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Congress itself. Accordingly, I wrote to Reverend Stuber telling him so and my reasons for reaching this conclusion. Reverend Stuber replied and out of this grew some correspondence. I am placing all of this correspondence in the RECORD along with the enclosure contained in Reverend Stuber's letters because I believe this exchange reflects a number of important issues which face our society today. The primary issue is that of encouraging public debate with an emphasis on the employment of proper and fair debating techniques. The material follows:

MISSOURI COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Jefferson City, Mo., November 20, 1961.
Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Webster Groves, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I hope you will take the enclosed resolution seriously.

It is certainly un-American to use the "unproved and unevaluated" material (lists) of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to call certain Protestant religious leaders Communist frontiers.

This matter is getting increasingly serious in the Midwest.

Please do not lend your high office to this kind of character assassination.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY I. STUBER,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Resolved, That the General Council of the American Baptist Convention deeply regrets and protests the release by Congressmen, for general distribution, of unproved and unevaluated material secured from the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This material gives the false impression that certain of our outstanding American religious leaders are associated with communism.

We further call the attention of Congress to the statement of J. Edgar Hoover in Senate Document No. 59, September 23, 1961, for the subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate:

"The danger of indiscriminately alleging that someone is a Communist merely because his views on a particular issue happen

to parallel the official party position is obvious. The confusion which is thereby created helps the Communists by diffusing the forces of their opponents."

We reaffirm our opposition to communism and protest guilt by association and the un-American practice of holding a man guilty until proved innocent. We hereby instruct the Division of Christian Social Concern to implement this protest in any and all ways open to it.

CLAYTON, Mo., November 28, 1961.

Mr. STANLEY I. STUBER,
Executive Director, Missouri Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR Mr. STUBER: Thank you for your letter of November 20, enclosing a resolution of the general council of the American Baptist denomination in respect to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I appreciate having called to my attention any instance of any person or any group using the unproved and unevaluated material of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to call any Protestant religious leader, or any other person, leader or otherwise, Communist frontiers. Certainly, this is improper and to be condemned. When any matter of this nature is called to my attention I take prompt action, I can assure you. Regrettably, you have given me no details.

It is equally improper and to be condemned for any person or group to issue general statements, using no material at all, that this is being done.

Your resolution constitutes an attack against the integrity of the Congress of the United States, using the very techniques your resolution deprecates. I have no brief for any improper actions of my colleagues in the Congress. I will take the floor of the House condemning the impropriety, as I have done on several occasions, after notifying the other party or parties that I was going to do so, if I feel the case is serious enough and it is warranted. Therefore, I cannot stand idly by when general and unproved charges are made against my colleague, as your resolution does, leaving me no opportunity either of disproving the charges or correcting the actions if the charges prove to be true.

The resolution makes this statement:

"We reaffirm our opposition to communism and protest guilt by association and the un-American practice of holding a man guilty until proved innocent."

I am in complete accord with these sentiments, and so are the overwhelming majority of the representatives the people have elected in free elections to the U.S. Congress to represent them in public matters involving the Federal Government.

The question now comes, Why does your group indulge in the very action it condemns? You have insinuated by innuendo and through guilt by association that the Congress as a whole has been guilty of using guilt by association and of holding a man guilty until proven innocent.

This is false. The Congress and Congressmen are innocent until proven guilty. Now, please supply your bill of particulars or retract your resolution. If the matter is getting increasingly serious in the Midwest, it should not be difficult for you to supply a bill of particulars.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

MISSOURI COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Jefferson City, Mo., November 30, 1961.
Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Clayton, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of November 28.

CVIII—238

It will interest you to know that the resolution of the American Baptist Convention was created out of a specific situation. The enclosed article from the official paper *Crusader* (of the American Baptist Convention) will give the particulars, as will also the marked editorial from the *Missouri American Baptist*. Since Dr. Dahlberg is of St. Louis this will be of particular concern to you.

During the past month letters have appeared in the *Jefferson City Tribune* attacking Dr. Dahlberg and the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

In Kansas City, for over a year, the *Kansas City News-Press* and the "Nite Beat" program of WHB, waged a campaign against the NCC and Protestant pastors connected with it.

You must know that the so-called lists which these papers, radio stations, and individuals use come from the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

How the resolution "constitutes an attack against the integrity of the Congress of the United States" is impossible to see. It was not intended as such, and, of course, is no such thing.

I am pleased that you agree with the substance of the resolution.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY I. STUBER,
Executive Director.

[From the *Missouri American Baptist*,
November 1961]

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Last month's letter attempted to deal with the matter of irresponsible statements regarding matters about which adequate information is lacking. The editor deeply regrets that it appears necessary to continue the discussion.

The November issue of *Crusader* carries, on page 7, a further illustration of this reprehensible practice. A Member of the Congress of the United States provided an organization known as the Circuit Riders, Inc., with a mass of unevaluated material which had been accumulated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities purporting to brand Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, beloved pastor of the Delmar Baptist Church in St. Louis, as a Communist fellow traveler. This material was circulated among the members of the Linden Avenue Baptist Church, Columbus, Ohio, many of whom accepted it as truth and, as a result, the church withdrew its invitation to host the Ohio Baptist Convention's annual sessions. Dr. Dahlberg had been scheduled as one of the principal speakers.

On Sunday, November 5, and again on the following Sunday, the *Jefferson City* (Mo.) News and Tribune published a letter from a Herman Otten, New Haven, Mo., making the same false charges, supported with the same source of information, i.e., the Circuit Riders. The good faith and genuine concern of Mr. Otten is no more questioned than is the good faith of the members of the Linden Avenue Baptist Church in Columbus, Ohio. What a pity it is that these good people have not been more careful to verify their information.

Although Dr. Dahlberg needs to make no explanations to American Baptists in Missouri, for records, the editor quotes below Dr. Dahlberg's answer to these charges as printed in the November issue of *Crusader*.

"I can conscientiously say that I have no communistic sympathies, have never had any connection with the Communist Party, and have never signed a petition which I knew to be sponsored by a Communist-front group. Like many other clergymen I have received dozens of them and have rejected them. I

would not knowingly lend my support to any group which was an agency of the Communist Party, since I am fully aware of the fact that communism has as its ultimate aim the crushing of all our liberties."

[From *Crusader*, November 1961]

CONTROVERSY IN OHIO—ACTING IN THE SPIRIT OF BAPTIST FREEDOM, OHIO BAPTISTS RESIST PRESSURES AND GIVE FAIR HEARING TO PASTOR DAHLBERG

(By Grace Goodman)

The only tinge of red visible in Columbus, Ohio, the second week in October was in the autumn leaves. And about the only person getting hot under the collar was the shirt-sleeved policeman directing traffic in front of First Baptist Church, where the 136th annual meeting of the Ohio Baptist Convention drew its largest crowd in history.

Some 1,000 persons turned out to hear speaker Edwin T. Dahlberg, an American Baptist pastor for 43 years who was twice president of the American Baptist Convention and who is the immediate past president of the National Council of Churches.

The situation hadn't always looked so serene. Less than a month before, the Linden Avenue Church (which had planned since last November to host the sessions) withdrew its invitation to the convention. First Church then volunteered to fill the gap.

Linden Avenue's objections centered around Dr. Dahlberg, officially invited to be the main speaker by the program committee, on which the host church had two representatives. But by May, the committee was told that Linden Avenue members were receiving literature indicating that Dr. Dahlberg was at worst a "fellow traveler," and at best, "soft on communism." They requested that the speaking invitation be withdrawn.

When First Church Pastor Livingston Lomas and his board agreed to take over the host job, they discovered some opposition within their fellowship too. But after a full discussion at a special meeting October 4, they voted (86-53) to reaffirm their invitation.

Dr. Chapman, in a letter to Ohio pastors about the change, pointed out that the charges against Dr. Dahlberg have never been upheld by any Government agency; that he has often visited top-secret military bases on invitation of the U.S. Defense Department; that his loyalty has never been questioned by the congregations he has served as pastor; and that "it is unfortunate that . . . one has only to be charged with some misdoing to be judged guilty."

Why not avoid the fuss by quietly withdrawing the invitation to Dr. Dahlberg? Dr. Chapman defined the issue at the open forum which was Dr. Dahlberg's first appearance at the convention. Besides the fact that to ask him not to come would seem to condone the charges, Chapman said: "Baptists are a non-creedal church and hold that each individual must be free to think, to believe, and to speak as he feels led by God's Holy Spirit. It is unthinkable that any believer be refused the right to speak in God's house because his opinions may not in all points be the same as those of other equally sincere believers."

Questions to Dr. Dahlberg at the forum centered around a list of 25 charges against him which had been circulated by the Circuit Riders, Inc. In substance, he replied:

Nine of the twenty-five citations concerned his signing petitions against provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. This bill was vetoed by President Truman; 10 of its clauses were pointed out for modification by President Eisenhower. "Though it has been helpful in keeping out various Communists and subversives, it has worked

great harm by favoring north European immigration at the expense of south Europeans."

Some charges had to do with Dr. Dahlberg's being a pacifist (a conviction he has held since 1915) and a member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, which he termed "purely a peace group, working for world peace and disarmament. Not by the remotest stretch of the imagination has it ever had any connection with communism. In fact, such an organization could not be tolerated in Russia, because it's against their doctrine of violence."

He was charged with helping sponsor a dinner for Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, who has been widely criticized for such actions as attending a dinner of the Society for Soviet-American Friendship in 1943. Not mentioned by critics is the fact that others at that dinner (given when Russia was a wartime ally) were John Foster Dulles, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and other top leaders of military, political, and religious circles.

He was among signers of a protest against the Atlantic Pact, because he is a pacifist. "I'm doubtful about the way to peace being through armaments."

He endorsed study of a report by seven clergymen who visited Yugoslavia, because "I'm interested in keeping open all possible avenues of communication. We shouldn't be afraid to hear facts whether they're from a land we approve or not."

"Charges of a more serious nature" included the fact that Dr. Dahlberg signed two petitions and letters in 1942-43 to free Earl Browder and block deportation of Harry Bridges. "I wish now that I had not signed them. But remember, this was in the middle of the last World War when we were not so aware of subversive activity on the part of our wartime allies. I would not sign these petitions today."

A final charge was that he interceded on behalf of Morton Sobell, a convicted Communist now in Alcatraz. "This action was purely on the pastoral level, with no political or ideological intentions. Mrs. Sobell, whom I had never known any more than I had known her husband, came to my office in tears for her children asking my support for a review of his case. In a spirit of Christian compassion I agreed. I would do the same for an alcoholic, a murderer or any other offender. They are in different brackets, but a review is always in order. New facts may come to light."

In a concluding statement, Dr. Dahlberg said he had wondered how he, a peaceable man, could become so controversial. "I'm convinced it's because God is shaping up a struggle between two views of religion. One of these limits the message of Jesus Christ to a small restricted area, such as the life of the Sunday school, the family, the prayer meeting, and a Christian's personal life. The other concept, a far bigger one, recognizes that Jesus Christ is Lord of all life and that everything in human experience is therefore of concern to the Saviour, whether it be personal, political, economic, or international."

In an interview, Dr. Dahlberg elaborated: "Many charges are made by people who are not so interested in me as a person as in discrediting the National Council of Churches and its member denominations, because they fear penetration of these larger areas by the gospel. Many fine people who are earnest and sincere Christians have become dupes of these rightwing groups in the same way as others have been dupes of leftwing groups."

"Our battle as American patriots today should be against the divisive elements of both of the extreme left and the extreme right. Both of these seemingly opposite

groups are sowing the seeds of fear and distrust, at the very time when as a nation we need to be united in loyalty to God and the highest concepts of our American freedom."

A standing ovation ended Dr. Dahlberg's first appearance. Many who had opposed his coming apparently were not present to hear his explanations, though one woman passed out literature after the forum.

The convention proceeded with Bible study by the Reverend Clarence Jordan, of Koinonia Farms, Ga.; more talks on evangelism and social action by Dr. Dahlberg; reelection of the Reverend Hugh Chittenden (Granville) as president, passage of resolutions including one opposing communism; and a final family banquet at the State fairgrounds, addressed by Baptist World Alliance executive, Dr. Josef Nordenhaug.

JANUARY 8, 1962.

Mr. STANLEY I. STUBER,
Executive Director,
Missouri Council of Churches,
Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR MR. STUBER: Thank you for your letter of November 1, 1961. I am happy to carry our discussion further in hopes of getting to the rest of our differences.

First, I perhaps should emphasize the part I have played over a period of the last 11 years I have served in the U.S. House of Representatives in trying to improve the House rules of procedure. I had a great deal to do with the basic reform of rules of procedure for House investigating committees back in 1956, mainly because I felt there had been flagrant and unnecessary abuses of the rights of our citizens.

I am still deeply concerned about correct rules of procedures and fair public debate. I am anxious that public debate be kept fair, not only on the floor of the House and in House committees, but in all public forums and media in the country.

Since the new rules of the House were adopted, I have seen little or no abuse of the rules of the House by the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have asked the critics of this committee, particularly those who criticized the committee for its alleged part in producing and disseminating the film "Operation Abolition," an alleged documentary film of the committee's hearings held in San Francisco, for a bill of particulars.

I have had a great deal of correspondence, but no bill of particulars, only unproven general statements of the most derogatory nature.

The resolution you sent to me comes at a time when there is a very obvious propaganda campaign being conducted to degrade the HUAC, and so the Congress itself.

This campaign is widespread. Whenever I seek to pin down the charges, those making them flee in the wake of more unproven charges, as I regret to state you have done.

I reiterate, I am anxious to take the HUAC or any Congressman, including myself if I have offended, to task for any violation of our rules of procedure or a violation of what are the rules of fair debate.

You state that it is impossible for you to see how your resolution constitutes an attack against the integrity of the Congress. I am glad to receive your statement that this was not the intention.

However, I asked you to read it over calmly and objectively to see if my charges are not fair.

The second line reads "regrets and protests the release by Congressmen, for general distribution." It is Congressmen, the resolution states, who are guilty of, to quote the last line of the resolution, "the un-American

practice of holding a man guilty until proved innocent."

This is a serious charge against Congressmen and, therefore, against the Congress. I have asked you for a bill of particulars. You have supplied me with none. In fact, the letter from the editor of the Word for the World, which you sent to me, substantiates my point that your charges are unproven generalities. This letter states: "A Member of the Congress of the United States provided an organization known as the Circuit Riders, Inc., with a mass of unevaluated material which had been accumulated by the HUAC." Now what Member of Congress did this? This is a violation of the rules of the House. If the HUAC let this material out of their files, there is a violation on the part of some member of that committee or some clerk. We have had violations in the past and, regrettably, we probably will have some in the future, but I can assure you when there are violations there are a number of Congressmen who stand ready and able to do something about it.

I submit, however, your organization has no right, particularly in the name of fair-play and Americanism, to air unspecified charges against a single Congressman, let alone Congressmen, which go to the root of their Americanism. I quote your resolution again, "the un-American practice."

The second paragraph of the resolution begins, "We particularly call the attention of Congress to the statement of J. Edgar Hoover." Now, what is the point of calling J. Edgar Hoover's statement to the attention of the Congress, other than to carry forward the basic theme of the resolution that Congressmen * * * and, now the Congress, have been guilty of "the un-American practice of holding a man guilty until proved innocent."

No, I believe you are not being fair when you state that the resolution was not intended as an attack upon the integrity of the Congress. Indeed, that is exactly what the resolution was doing. What I wanted is a documentation of the charges that Congressmen, a congressional committee, or an individual Congressman have done certain things which justified making such a heinous charge.

I shall place this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with my comments upon it, and your comments upon my comments, for the public at large to evaluate.

There is a basic rule in the courts of equity, a good rule, that he who would seek equity must first do equity. I do not go this far in considering complaints from the public about the operation of the Congress. However, I do go that far when it comes to public debate. Anyone who resorts to the technique of attacking the integrity of those people or institutions with whom or with which they find themselves in disagreement, instead of attacking the arguments and facts of their antagonists, has been guilty of violating the basic rule of fair debate, i.e., avoiding ad hominem argument.

When the churches of this country through their councils or other official organizations, employ what many people have dubbed McCarthyism (the very coining of this word is ad hominem argument), then indeed the moral fiber of our country is in serious danger.

I trust that the Missouri Council of Churches will review its resolution to see if the charges I have leveled against it are not well founded. Certainly, I understand how we all, at times, in a wave of emotion go off base, but surely we can be big enough to correct the damage done when we realize we have gone off base. I say this as one

who has sinned himself, in ignorance and in passion, from time to time.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

MISSOURI COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 10, 1962.

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Your letter of January 8 is appreciated, although it contains several false statements.

In the first place, the resolution under question did not originate in, nor does it have any connection with the Missouri Council of Churches. It was adopted on November 5, 1961, by the General Council of the American Baptist Convention (denomination) of which I am a member. Therefore, if anyone is to be condemned it is not the Missouri Council of Churches, but the American Baptist Convention. I hope you will get this point clear.

In the second place, we were asked by the General Council of the American Baptist Convention to place this resolution before certain key Congressmen. Is it a crime to make the views of a denominational body known?

I suppose you are now aware of the fact that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has just issued a statement admitting certain errors in its film "Operation Abolition."

As far as I know no one is condemning the House of Representatives as a body. What we are doing, in this instance, is to say that listings compiled by the HUAC should not be released by Congressmen at the request of any citizen who happens to write in. As you must know, these "listings" are being used over the Nation as a form of public blackmail.

Your concern in this matter is greatly appreciated, but I feel that you are not willing to face up to the real issue expressed in the enclosed resolution.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY I. STUBER.

MARCH 5, 1962.

STANLEY I. STUBER, Th. M., D.D.,
Executive Director and Minister, Missouri
Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR REVEREND STUBER: I have delayed answering your January 10, 1962, letter because I wanted to be temperate in my reply.

It comes as a shock to find ministers of the Gospel calling statements of disagreement false statements. I hardly think my attribution of the resolution of the Council of the American Baptist Convention to the Missouri Council of Churches was false, even though it might be in error. Certainly you promulgated this resolution with the letterhead of the Missouri Council for Churches and signed the letter "Executive Director." Nowhere in the body of the forwarding letter is the reader's attention called to the fact that this resolution you ask be considered seriously was made by a different organization. As a matter of fact one can properly conclude that the purpose of disseminating this resolution on the stationery of the Missouri Council of Churches with the signature of the executive director was an act of approval and endorsement of the Missouri Council of Churches.

If you had desired to forward this resolution as a member of the General Council of the American Baptist Convention you could have done so and there would have been no misunderstanding. This you did not choose to do.

I shall try to clarify this point as you ask me to, by writing to the members of the Missouri Council of Churches to find out if

you had authority to use its letterhead and to sign the letter of dissemination of executive director. If you had such authority, then I am not in error in attributing the resolution to the Missouri Council of Churches although it was originally promulgated by another organization. If you had no such authority, another point is in order to be raised.

If you would care to clarify this point yourself, I would be happy, because after all you are the one in the best position to clarify it.

To move on. Indeed it is no crime to make the views of a denominational body known to key Congressmen. Quite the contrary, it is more of an offense in representative government when our citizens or groups of our citizens fail to make their views known on the issues of the day. I commend both the General Council of American Baptist Convention and the Missouri Council of Churches for this phase of their actions.

Let me ask in return: Don't you believe it is proper and responsive for a Representative to reply to such expressed views pointing out areas of agreement or disagreement if such exist? I believe it is through this kind of exchange that government by the people really begins to operate.

Our exchange of views can be quite healthy and move the debate forward if we will confine our attention to the issues raised and lay off smearing the motives of those with whom we are in disagreement. Indeed, that was the tenor of my first reply.

I have long been aware of the fact that the HUAC has admitted errors occurred in the film "Operation Abolition" which was compiled and edited by a private organization. This is not news. However, the HUAC has pointed out that these were not errors of consequence and occurred as the result of the job of editing and compiling which by its very nature is difficult. The HUAC has emphatically pointed out that the film is a fair presentation of the issues brought to a head in San Francisco at the time of the HUAC hearings. Having gone into this matter in some depth I am inclined to agree with the committee.

We are in agreement about one thing, and it is an important point. "Listings compiled by the HUAC should not be released by Congressmen at the request of any citizen who happens to write in." I go even further and so do the Rules of the House of Representatives which govern the action of the HUAC and other committees. Any information of a derogatory nature cannot be made public, in any manner, without a vote of the committee involved after executive session.

You state, "As you must know, these listings are being used over the Nation as a form of blackmail." This is reiterating your general charge. I do not know this to be a fact. I have pointed out in my letters that we need a bill of particulars which back up these generalities. You provide none. If any Congressman or the committee in an unauthorized manner has released material upon which such listings are based, then we have a specific violation about which we can do something. Or if there are listings which falsely say they are based upon such released material there is something we can do about these listings. I suspect the listings you refer to are the official listings of the committee or of the Attorney General setting forth the various Communist organizations operating in our society. These listings, however, are official and there are correct procedures established for listing such organizations and these procedures provide methods whereby the organizations accused or members thereof can set forth their case as to why the organization should not be so listed.

We come back to the basic point. The resolution makes some very general and very derogatory charges against the Congress of the United States, intentionally or otherwise. I have asked for a bill of particulars to substantiate these charges. You have declined to present such a bill of particulars. Under these circumstances fairness requires that you do what you can through the two organizations of which you are a member to correct the damage you have contributed to by disseminating derogatory and unsubstantiated charges against the integrity of many individuals and the public institutions of our society.

I think we have now reached a point where this material, your letters, and enclosures, my replies should be a matter of public record. This is an important public issue which you have raised initially and publicly. I shall be pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any additional comments you may wish to make.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

NAVAL HOMES FOR TREATMENT IN THE FIELD OF GERIATRICS

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that will establish two naval homes for treatment in the field of geriatrics, one to be located on the east coast and one to be located on the west coast.

To date, a very serious problem exists due to the inadequacies of existing facilities to meet the needs of the active and retired members of the Navy.

In my own congressional district, the naval hospital is experiencing serious difficulties in meeting the medical needs of active and retired personnel.

We cannot afford to jeopardize the whole naval career system by failure to meet the needs of these career men when they reach retirement. This is the situation we are faced with today.

The following statement by Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, prepared for the retired naval personnel newsletter, succinctly sets forth the critical nature of this problem.

I urge immediate attention be given to this legislation.

GREETINGS FROM THE CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The 6 years that the retired activities section has been in operation have seen an increase in the number of personnel transferred to the Fleet Reserve or retired, so that presently over 119,000 are in a retired pay status. This growth has affected and will continue to affect other areas of retirement living—retirement pay, benefits, and privileges.

As a matter of information almost 39,000 of these retirees live in California and nearly 10,000 in Florida. Large groups live in New York and around the Washington, Virginia, and Maryland area. Apparently, climate, recreation facilities, and accessibility to

uniformed services hospitals, commissaries, and exchanges plus other advantages influence the choice of retirement homes.

These large concentrations of Navy retirees from the other services are causing serious overloading of some of the very service facilities which make many areas desirable for retirement homes. Hospitals and commissaries in California, Florida, Washington, D.C., and many other areas are operating well beyond their designated capacities. Since there is great difficulty in obtaining funds from the military budget to be earmarked specifically to increased hospital capabilities for retired persons and their dependents, this condition will worsen rather than improve as the numbers of retirees multiply.

As a consequence, your equity in retirement benefits which you expected at the completion of your military career is being diluted. As Chief of Navy Personnel, I can assure you all that the Navy as well as the Department of Defense is well aware of the seriousness of this problem and will continue to support and promote the interests of our retired military personnel.

W. R. SMEDBERG III.

INCREASING THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, regardless of statements by proponents of this measure, it is so politically motivated that the public throughout the country is aware of the purely political and expedient nature of this bill. With the House being naturally unwieldy by its size an increase is impossible to justify.

It would be much more practical for us to devote our energies to streamlining House procedures to achieve more effective operation.

However, the political motivation of this measure is really the point since, if an increase in the size of the House is at all justifiable, it should have been planned early in 1961 rather than now, to solve the political problems of reapportionment in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. All the other States that were faced with reapportionment problems as a result of the 1960 census met their obligation through proper action by their State general assemblies. The failure of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania to solve their reapportionment in an acceptable fashion to a few individuals results in the sorry spectacle of the House increasing its size merely to accommodate a handful of individual Congressmen. This is bad legislation and bad politics.

In Illinois we were faced with a difficult reapportionment task and after a lengthy and certainly controversial debate, the State legislature met its obligation. As I have indicated, the very same circumstances prevailed in numerous other States.

I am opposed to this bill but if I were attempting to perfect it I would introduce an amendment calling it a bill for the personal benefit of certain Massachusetts and Pennsylvania Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. At least then, the title would fit the intent of the bill.

A SALUTE TO THE 4-H CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the more than 2 million young Americans who are presently members of 4-H Clubs. They are demonstrating every day their devotion to good citizenship by participating in various civic activities all across the Nation.

I am particularly proud of Miss Linda Markins, a resident of Delaware County, in my district. She was one of the six outstanding 4-H Club members in the Nation to come to Washington this week. She and the other five so chosen admirably represented their fellow 4-H'ers. They certainly represented the highest type of 4-H Club work and leadership.

It is a pleasure to salute all present and past members of 4-H for their valuable contributions to progress in our agricultural community at large.

RETRAINING OF INDIVIDUALS SUFFERING SPEECH OR HEARING IMPAIRMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, disordered speech or impaired hearing, the most common disabilities of children in this country, may seriously handicap individuals of all ages in their efforts to profit from the educational opportunities offered by our schools, or to become self-sufficient and self-supporting members of their communities. More than 8 million Americans of all ages suffer from speech or hearing impairments. The consequences of a serious disability of communication may retard or frustrate completely a child's efforts to advance in school or may leave social or emotional scars on both the individual and his family.

Children and adults with speech and hearing impairments require the services

of speech and hearing specialists who have acquired a high degree of clinical competence through study and experience. These noninstructional clinical specialists provide their services in a variety of environments including our elementary and secondary schools, hospitals and community centers. There is a desperate shortage of qualified personnel in the speech and hearing field to provide needed services. At the present time, there are only some 2,000 certified speech and hearing specialists and 5,000 noncertified specialists in this field. A minimum of 20,000 speech and hearing specialists are urgently needed to properly diagnose, train and rehabilitate these 8 million handicapped individuals.

In order to relieve this situation resulting from the critical deficit of adequately trained personnel, our universities should be graduating at least 1,500 properly trained speech and hearing specialists each year. Only 400 such specialists are currently being graduated each year.

The need for speech and hearing personnel is not peculiar to any area. Speech and hearing specialists are needed in all States. For each State to provide the faculties and facilities needed to train these speech and hearing specialists would be a wasteful duplication.

The bill I have introduced today provides for a grants-in-aid program to assist our colleges and universities in the training of a supply of speech and hearing specialists needed to diagnose, train and rehabilitate our 8 million speech and hearing handicapped Americans.

TWENTY YEARS OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America last month celebrated its 20th birthday. Henry Loomis, director of the Voice of America, delivered a most interesting, fact-filled speech before the National Press Club, outlining the work which the Voice of America is doing in the cold war. All those who heard and read this speech received a much clearer picture of the complicated task which this Agency is undertaking. His speech gives us a clear picture of the revolution in communications which is knitting the whole world together.

ADDRESS BY HENRY LOOMIS, DIRECTOR, VOICE OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1962

The Voice of America will be 20 years old next week.

For 20 years, the Voice, representing the U.S. Government and the American people, has talked directly to the people of the world—often over the objections of their

governments. The Voice of America is the only mechanism available to the U.S. Government capable of such direct, universal, personal, and immediate communication.

Even though the Voice is 20 years old, it is little known and less understood by the American public—especially the fundamental and controversial issues involved.

Let's examine some of these issues as they affect the problems of what we should say on our direct shortwave programs.

What results can be expected from broadcasting—or any informational activity? Some seem to believe that when things are not going well all that is needed is more money and better people working on propaganda. This belief has the advantage of not requiring the development of new policy or the taking of direct action.

Others seem to believe that all propaganda is ineffectual, a waste of money, and should be dispensed with.

I believe the truth lies in between. Propaganda cannot supersede the facts of life. However, good propaganda can increase the impact and effect of favorable events and decrease the impact of unfavorable events. The mechanical act of broadcasting, in itself, will not affect people's actions. However, the facts described in the broadcasts and the interpretation and analysis of those facts can and do have an impact—if they are believed. The first requirement of any radio is to earn the audiences' trust—to be credible.

In my judgment, radio is primarily a strategic or long range tool. If you have a faithful and believing audience, you can provide them with much information and much food for thought on which they will rely, when, in a crisis, they must decide their course of action quickly and instinctively.

Another basic choice facing the Voice is what do its initials VOA stand for; the voice of the administration or the Voice of America. The problem arises in our coverage of all controversial issues when significant and responsible groups or individuals disagree vociferously with the administration's policy. The issue also arises whenever there is significant debate in the Congress or by the public on sensitive issues on which the administration has been silent.

The Voice has long aspired to be the Voice of America—a far more difficult job. This role was formally assigned to the Voice in a directive of several years ago. Our job is to try to make U.S. policy understandable everywhere—and palatable where possible. But, at the same time, we must reflect a balanced projection of significant and responsible American thought. We must try to show that the United States derives strength from its diversity and is not in a state of anarchy. This requires us to judge who and what is "responsible" and "significant," and to determine what is a "fair" balance.

We meet this issue hourly in the preparation of our newscasts. Some urge us to include only "positive" news, to ignore the unpleasant or the failures. As one critic put it, "Ivory soap commercials speak about being 99 and 44/100 percent pure—you don't hear any discussion of the 56/100 percent impurities." Other critics believe that common people, particularly those in the underdeveloped areas, are uncritical, believing everything they hear. These critics conclude that the audiences believe all they hear from the Communists and that our carrying unfavorable facts merely tends to confirm Moscow's accusations. Radio Moscow, Radio Peiping, and many others follow this principle.

The Voice does not. Not only do we believe such a policy to be ineffective since all people—irrespective of education, race, or

status—have a long nose for the detection—in time—of the phony, but in our country such a course is impossible. The more controversial, the more negative the news, the faster and more detailed the coverage by the great international wire services, the foreign and domestic newspapers and magazines—and by our competitors, the other broadcasters. No matter how negative the facts really are, Moscow can make them appear worse. To be believed by our audience we must carry all the important facts—good and bad. To be most effective, we try to reach the audience before our competitors—to assure that negative information, when first heard, is backgrounded with all the positive aspects we can find.

While this problem is difficult when the negative event occurs within the United States, it is particularly difficult when it occurs in a foreign, friendly country and the local government tries to suppress it. A student riot clearly directed against a friendly government, which the local papers and radio have not been allowed to mention, is a frequent case in point.

Obviously the Voice seizes every opportunity to present the failures and weaknesses of the Communists, but in a sober and factual manner.

The Voice attempts above all else to be sure that its news is accurate. When necessary we sacrifice speed for accuracy. We do not carry speculation. Normally we require that a news item be available on at least two responsible news sources before we use it. We clearly separate our news from the commentaries in which we argue the American position as persuasively as possible.

Another fundamental decision, interwoven with the above, involves what type of audience the Voice should aim at. Should we seek primarily to speak to people dominated by communism, to the uncommitted, or to our allies? Should we aspire to mass audiences or aim primarily at leadership groups?

In analyzing this question we draw a sharp line between our shortwave broadcasts, direct to the audience, and the very large program we have of placing material on local radios around the world.

We broadcast 730 hours per week on shortwave in 37 languages—an average of 4 programs at any one time and more radio volume than CBS, NBC, and ABC produce all together.

In these direct, shortwave broadcasts we aspire to an audience of all those who are curious. If a man merely wishes entertainment he will listen to local radios. We seek the man or woman who wishes information, information about America, information about the world, information about his own country in those cases where the local radios and newspapers cannot be trusted. We try to reach the person who seeks information about factual events, who wishes to listen to diverse explanations of the importance and effect of the events. We aim at an audience that wants to know more about the American political system, the American economic system, American science, American culture, American views on communism, on neutralism—on all aspects of the world and mankind; an audience more interested in information than entertainment.

Obviously we can reach an audience only among those who have access to radios capable of hearing our broadcasts.

The advent of cheap transistorized radio receivers is revolutionizing the size, composition, and distribution of the potential audience. Many of us believe that the transistor radio will, in its own way, have as profound an effect on the widening of men's horizons as the inventions of the printing press and the airplane.

There are now 200 million radio receivers outside of the United States and Canada. Twenty years ago, when the Voice started, the war had destroyed many radios but there probably were no more than 10 to 20 million. In just the last year, radio receivers increased by 13 million sets.

The potential audience in Africa, Asia, and parts of Latin America is increasing rapidly while the old radio audience in Europe and Japan is being cut into by TV. However at times of crisis, many turn to radio because of its speed and the opportunity it gives to hear conflicting views from different countries. During normal times, many of the more curious, rather than staying with the entertainment programs on TV, still listen to the informational programs available on radio. We, therefore, are faced in our direct broadcasts with a new unsophisticated audience at the same time that our old audiences require more erudite material.

Another facet of the problem, interwoven with our choice of audience, is the choice of types of programs. How much news, how much music, how much "freighted" material arguing our case, how much entertainment; do we give the audience what they want or do we give them what we want them to hear.

In trying to balance all the conflicting demands, we always remember that shortwave radio is competitive. If the audience gets bored or cannot understand, a twist of the dial will bring in a new station. The audience can and will leave you at any moment.

International broadcasting is fiercely competitive and becoming more so every day. At last count there were 14,000 program hours per week of international broadcasts by all nations.

Moscow is the dominant broadcaster with over 1,000 hours per week. Peiping is in second place with 734 hours per week, but during the last year the Voice has pulled up until we are nearly tied with them.

In choosing our short-wave programs we must not only think of the other major broadcasters but must also take into account regional broadcasters, many of whom are dominant in their areas, such as Cairo in the Arab world and Africa.

The Voice does not try to be entertaining on its shortwave broadcasts; the local or regional broadcasters can always excel in entertainment. The Voice tries to provide unique information or unique services not available elsewhere. We stress information about the United States and the U.N.; we broadcast jazz to those areas—such as Russia—where the state frowns on it; we attempt to provide accurate and balanced news to areas flooded with the distortions of others. We provided continuous coverage of the Glenn orbital shot in English and also featured it in all our 36 other language programs.

In addition to direct shortwave broadcasts of the Voice, we prepare a massive amount of material for tailoring and placement on local radios by the overseas USIS posts. We place 10 times more material than we broadcast direct—about one-half of it in Latin America. Much is unattributed to VOA. Since this material appears on local radios, we can reach a much broader audience. We provide American music and radio dramas to attract listeners. Our programs are accurate, the style tailored to the individual country and the subject matter is selected to present U.S. policy, and America in general, in as favorable a light as possible.

However, placement of radio programs requires the approval of both the local radio station and the local government. We place the least material in those countries where we need to place the most—where the local

government either censors heavily or is antagonistic to the United States.

Local placement is an invaluable adjunct to direct shortwave broadcasts, but only the direct broadcasts can relay events to an audience when the local government disapproves, and only direct broadcasts can bring immediate reportage of an event such as the Glenn space shot.

No matter how well our shortwave programs are done, they are useless if they cannot be heard by the audience. Here too the Voice faces fierce problems.

It must always be borne in mind that the Voice is broadcasting and not communicating in the technical sense. In communications, such as the normal commercial or military circuits, there is a professional at each end of the circuit; each end is equipped with special equipment permitting the use of many fancy techniques. Often communications can be scheduled for the time of day when the electrical characteristics are best. In communications all that is required is a signal strong enough and clear enough to be understood.

All is different in broadcasting. We must broadcast not to one professional but to many laymen. Broadcasters must work into the listener's receiver—a receiver he cannot modify—a receiver often out of repair—a receiver operated by an amateur—who may or may not be interested. The broadcaster must broadcast at the time of day most convenient to the audience—frequently the early evening which is one of the worst times of day electrically. But most important of all, a broadcaster must not only be heard, he must be as loud and clear as his competitors. Relative, rather than absolute, quality is what counts. The Voice can now be heard everywhere in the world—on a good receiver—but usually our competitors come in with a louder and clearer signal.

The United States is faced with a most difficult technical problem. We are thousands of miles from our nearest audience; in all areas except Latin America, we are farther away than our competitors. It is therefore impossible to provide a competitive signal directly from the United States. We must rely on overseas relay stations, the rights for which must be negotiated with sovereign countries. This is difficult since such agreements often are used by neutralist or hostile groups within the country to embarrass the host government. The Congress has provided funds whenever we have been able to obtain an agreement; our bottleneck has been the difficulty of obtaining and retaining agreements.

The agency is now operating 87 transmitters, located in 8 domestic and 9 foreign locations. While we have three massive million-watt medium-wave transmitters in Europe and the Far East, we have no shortwave transmitters which are powerful by modern standards. Many are 25 years old; the newest is 10 years old.

However, in the last 4 years, we have received \$50 million from the Congress (all we have requested) with which we are constructing (1) the largest transmitter complex in the free world, and probably in the entire world, in North Carolina; (2) a major new station in Liberia which will be the most powerful on the African Continent; (3) more powerful transmitters in Great Britain which will boost our power there fivefold; (4) a land-based facility at Rhodes, Greece, to replace the ship *Courier*, which will increase the strength of the Voice's signal fourfold in Cairo; and (5) a unique complex of four mobile 50-kilowatt transmitters to be truck mounted and air transportable. This totals over 8.5 million watts under construction—approximately doubling our present shortwave power. We have outlined a

program for three more massive shortwave facilities overseas, required to give the Voice competitive coverage everywhere. When we obtain the agreements, we will ask the Congress for funds.

Another major problem faced by all broadcasters is the difficulty of finding—and keeping—clear frequencies. This problem is very rapidly getting worse as the number of broadcasters increases and the number of electrically usable frequencies decreases as a result of the present phase of the sunspot cycle.

Today the world's broadcasters are utilizing over 14,000 transmitter-hours per day, an average of over 500 frequencies being used simultaneously. While the U.N., through the ITU, tries to assure orderly use of the radio spectrum, some interference is inevitable. Interference is increasing as the hours of broadcasting increase. Each of the large broadcasters is increasing both power and broadcasting hours in order to remain competitive, and most newly independent countries rush into international broadcasting so that their views may be heard. Twenty years ago when the Voice started, there were only one-fifth as many broadcasters on the air.

Nature is compounding the difficulty. The degree of sunspot activity determines the degree of ionization in the atmosphere which in turn determines how many frequencies can be used effectively for broadcasting. The more sunspots, the more frequencies. During the 1950's the sunspots were increasing, expanding the spectrum at about the rate new broadcasters were starting to broadcast. The peak of the sunspot cycle—in 1958—was the highest ever recorded. But now it is rapidly decreasing and is predicted to reach a very low level by the mid-sixties. It is not expected to rise as high as the last peak for the rest of this century.

The only recourse open to the Voice is to have more power than competitors on the same frequency, to be able to predict the best frequency ahead of our competitors, and to be more flexible in the use of frequencies. This is jungle warfare—victory goes to the strong, the smart, and the quick.

In addition to the increasing competition and the shrinking frequency spectrum, the Voice must also meet—and overcome—deliberate jamming of our programs by Communist governments. A jammer is just a normal transmitter, transmitting noises on your frequency. Jamming—like the Berlin wall—is an admission of bankruptcy. The Communists now employ something like 2,500 jammers against the Voice and other free world broadcasts. We estimate that it would cost us over \$150 million per year to operate a similar network. This is three or four times the amount spent by all free world radios broadcasting to the Communist bloc. The size and skill of the Communist jamming network has been steadily increasing. Cuba has been jamming for about 6 months.

However, in spite of all the Communists can do, most of our programs get through behind the Iron Curtain—especially outside the major cities. We record over a million observations a year from peripheral monitoring posts in order to gage our penetration and follow Communist jamming tactics. We estimate that one-fourth of our programs can be heard in most major cities where the jammers are concentrated, and that three-fourths of our programs can be heard outside the major cities.

Since Khrushchev's visit to this country over 2 years ago, a new twist has been added—intermittent, content jamming. The Russians no longer attempt to jam certain news items and not others. The percentage of attempted jamming varies from day to day and from subject to subject, providing us with an unorthodox measure of the tem-

perature of the cold war and an index of the subjects to which they are most sensitive. This week the percentage of attempted jamming has been running about 50 percent.

While the jamming system is good, it is not infallible. This was proven last fall when the Voice mounted a special operation to inform the Russian people about the nuclear tests conducted by their Government and world reaction thereto. We concentrated all of the 52 transmitters capable of reaching the Soviet Union on this program, canceling or postponing programs in many other languages to do so. Even though we had announced this special program for a week in order to alert our audience, the jammers failed in their task—in fact, their control system came apart at the seams. Our program could be clearly heard everywhere in the Soviet Union—even in Moscow. Two days later Khrushchev announced the tests to his own people.

How well is the Voice meeting the challenge? Is all this effort, hardware, and money worth it? How many people do we influence?

One way to answer these questions would be to examine our audience and its reaction to our programs. Unfortunately, precise research or even access is impossible in many areas. However, certain broad conclusions can be drawn from the myriad of detailed bits of information which the Agency's research office collects and analyzes.

Both the Voice and BBC have significantly larger audiences than either Moscow or Peking—even though both Communist countries broadcast longer hours on more powerful transmitters.

The Voice's direct audience on an average day is numbered in the tens of millions, of whom the majority are living under communism.

We know our audience is not an exclusive one, that most who listen to us also listen to others—frequently many others.

We know that most who listen to us discuss with others the facts and opinions heard on the Voice so that our programs affect a far larger group than our direct audience.

At times of international crisis our audience increases markedly, especially in the geographic area affected by the crisis where many people wish to know what is happening, and specifically what U.S. policy may be. Likewise, during great human stories, like the Glenn space voyage, our audience pyramids.

The audience to our music programs—especially jazz programs—is significantly larger than the audience to our substantive programs. Our program "Music U.S.A."—a daily hour and a half of music interspersed with news in special, slow English—has probably the largest audience of any single radio program in the world. We estimate that in Russia alone, the audience is in the order of magnitude of 10 million on an average day.

Our news programs have more audience than our feature materials. We know our average audience is young, and better educated than the average in most countries.

In assessing effectiveness, however, individuals more than numbers are important. We know of heads of state who listen to us daily; we know of foreign ministers, defense ministers, and many other officials who listen to us. We know we have a wide audience among foreign embassy personnel living in third countries.

We know our programs are monitored by many governments, then summarized and distributed among the ruling elite. That is one audience which we can count on.

We know our programs—especially the news—are monitored by many foreign radios

and newspapers and used as a source for their output.

We are certain that we successfully challenge the Communist monopoly of information to their own people. We have frequently seen cases where the regime has been forced to admit or discuss a subject they would have preferred to leave alone.

Many foreign stations relay portions of our direct shortwave programs, thus increasing our potential audience as well as endorsing our product. Many universities, newspapers, and educators use our scripts and tapes. Publishers have brought out many printed versions of our scripts in book form.

One measure of our effectiveness is the quick response we get whenever we make a mistake.

And of course we have letters—several hundred thousand a year. Letters which discuss specific programs; letters which give views on our programs in general; letters which ask help; letters which criticize the Voice and the United States. An increasing number of letters speak of our objective news, of the scope of our coverage, or trust in our objectivity.

Many of the letters give a warm intimate picture of the audience, like a recent one from Sante Diourbel in the interior of Senegal: "5 days out of 7 days of the week, after evening prayer, some 20 of my friends listen with me to your broadcasts because they do not want to miss the program and the mosque where we pray together is only 20 meters from my radio."

Let me close with a personal experience.

I was in interior Tanganyika a few years ago. We came to a river with only a hand-drawn barge as a ferry. It took some time to get all the trucks across, so I joined a group of men asleep in the shade of a mango tree. One rolled over and said something in Swahili. I said I was sorry but I only spoke English. He said that was quite all right, he spoke English. He did—halting, broken English but understandable. He had had 6 years of schooling. He asked me about a news event I had heard that morning on the Voice. I asked him where he had learned the fact—he said he listened to the Voice every day. I asked if he ever listened to other radios. Oh yes—he listened to BBC, Moscow, Cairo, and Peiping every day. Naturally he listened to his local station, Dar-es-Salaam, but he also listened to Nairobi and Salisbury. He frequently listened to Brazzaville for music. He regretted that he had heard Ghana only infrequently.

We discussed world affairs for several hours until all our trucks were across the river and then we gave him a lift to his house a couple of miles down the road.

His House was the typical wattle-and-mud hut—with an antenna wire coming out of the door and up a tree.

He wore no shoes but he was the secretary of the local chapter of TANU, the leading political party in Tanganyika.

Radio was his window on the world—a window for information, for ideas, for entertainment. He listened to all the radios he could hear. He knew to whom he was listening. He compared. He drew his own conclusions.

He was typical of the tough, intellectually curious audience we face in international broadcasting. He was the challenge the Voice faces. The Voice is meeting the challenge.

FOOD MACHINERY CORP.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at

this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply chagrined to learn today that the Department of the Army announced the award of two supply contracts valued at \$64,369,241.34 for the procurement of a quantity of armored personnel carriers, M-113, to the Food Machinery Corp., of San Jose, Calif. This is the same FMC which 2 years ago received contracts for the production of the M-113 personnel carrier under regulations which I termed as "rigged bidding" procedures. It seems as though this corporation has developed techniques which work in all situations.

Something new has been added this time. The corporation very cleverly arranged for production in Charleston, W. Va., a persistent labor surplus area, as well as in its San Jose, Calif., plant.

On May 24, 1961, the FMC acquired the old Navy depot in Charleston, W. Va., for the sum of \$4,320,000. This plant was acquired as surplus property through the General Services Administration. At the time the FMC acquired this plant, they announced that it would be used for the manufacture of chemicals and would provide employment in the West Virginia labor surplus area. Apparently this was never their intention. They bought this Government-owned plant because they had inside information of the Government's intention to produce the M-113 personnel carrier at a location geographically separate from the principal FMC plant in San Jose, Calif.

At this time I am not convinced that the Army Ordnance Corps has met the requirements of the procurement regulations or the requirements of the General Accounting Office in this procurement. If a second source is required for military procurement, it seems to me that the second source should be separate and distinct from the primary source. The same corporation should be barred from bidding as a second-source supplier so that the Government may profit from competitive methods of production which would lower the unit cost of the end product.

In the spring of 1960 the Hébert Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee investigated these charges of "rigged bidding" in the M-113 contract and found that they were substantiated. Thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States on July 6, 1961, severely criticized the award of the contract to the FMC Corp. On a later occasion, I expect to take the floor and further discuss the many irregularities in procurement which were identified by the Comptroller General.

It is difficult for me to believe that this procurement is in accord with either the procurement regulations or the recommendations of the General Accounting Office.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 25 minutes, today, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois), for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGLER (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois), for 60 minutes, on March 12, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MAGNUSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MCINTIRE.

Mr. COHELAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois) were granted permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAILEY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2774. An act to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of acting secretaries for such territories under certain conditions.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2990. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.;

H.R. 7666. An act to amend section 17(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin

Islands pertaining to the salary of the government comptroller;

H.R. 7855. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to a compact ratified by the States of Louisiana and Texas and relating to the waters of the Sabine River; and

H.R. 10050. An act to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year covering expenditures from the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt.

Accordingly, there are submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated reports of the following House committees: Appropriations, Armed Services, Rules, and Veterans' Affairs:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Subcommittees:											
Agriculture.....	U.S. dollar.....		1,651.00		1,508.25		7,151.74		451.45		10,762.44
Defense.....	do.....		1,438.53		1,070.60		5,704.52		645.60		8,859.25
Foreign Operations.....	do.....		3,035.25		2,168.30		16,336.35		1,004.65		22,544.55
General Government Matters and Commerce.....	do.....		466.63		281.33		1,536.49		157.34		2,441.79
Interior.....	do.....		627.08		517.10		6,210.79		324.25		7,679.22
Military Construction.....	do.....		248.69		136.92		1,298.96		82.75		1,767.32
State, Justice, Judiciary.....	do.....		2,130.33		1,498.19		10,193.17		549.75		14,371.44
Treasury-Post Office.....	do.....		425.50		301.97		3,028.67		72.46		3,828.59
Total.....			10,023.01		7,482.66		51,460.69		3,288.24		72,254.60

FEB. 26, 1962.

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. A. E. Santangelo:											
Italy.....	U.S. dollar.....		167.50		145.25		31.00		36.75		380.50
Germany.....	do.....		56.00		55.00		8.80		7.20		127.00
France.....	do.....		42.00		39.50		10.50		8.05		100.05
United States.....	do.....						6.00		3.50		9.50
Transportation (2 trips).....	do.....						2,560.20				2,560.20
Subtotal.....			265.50		239.75		2,606.50		55.50		3,167.25
Hon. Robert H. Michel:											
Morocco.....	U.S. dollar.....		58.00		61.00		9.00		16.00		144.00
Liberia.....	do.....		90.00		57.50		5.00		14.25		166.75
Nigeria.....	do.....		84.00		53.00		6.00		5.50		148.50
Congo.....	do.....				32.50		8.50		14.00		55.00
South Africa.....	do.....		70.50		57.50		10.00		15.25		153.25
Rhodesia.....	do.....		28.20		24.00		5.50		7.50		65.20
Kenya.....	do.....		46.30		36.50		8.50		12.50		103.80
Ethiopia.....	do.....		41.00		58.50		10.25		19.25		119.25
Italy.....	do.....		104.00		80.50		13.50		20.25		218.25
Germany.....	do.....		56.00		57.00		7.50		12.00		132.50
France.....	do.....		42.00		38.00		10.75		8.75		99.50
England.....	do.....		36.00		45.00		6.25		8.50		95.75
United States.....	do.....		33.25		31.50		13.75		35.75		114.25
Transportation.....	do.....						2,191.00				2,191.00
Subtotal.....			689.25		632.50		2,304.75		180.50		3,807.00
Ross Pope:											
Morocco.....	U.S. dollar.....		58.00		64.00		9.50		15.00		146.50
Liberia.....	do.....		90.00		48.00		4.50		19.05		161.55
Nigeria.....	do.....		84.00		52.50		6.00		7.00		149.50
Congo.....	do.....				36.50		9.25		12.50		58.25
South Africa.....	do.....		70.50		46.00		9.50		16.25		142.25
Rhodesia.....	do.....		28.20		21.00		5.00		7.50		61.70
Kenya.....	do.....		46.30		35.25		12.90		19.70		114.15
Ethiopia.....	do.....		41.00		45.00		8.00		11.50		105.50
Egypt.....	do.....		30.25		28.50		4.00		4.50		67.25
Italy.....	do.....		55.50		70.50		7.30		16.60		149.90
Germany.....	do.....		56.00		56.00		8.50		9.50		130.00

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ross Pope—Continued											
France.....	U.S. dollar		42.00		34.50		11.50		8.05		96.05
England.....	do		24.50		30.25		6.25		6.50		67.50
United States.....	do		70.00		68.00		8.75		61.80		208.55
Transportation.....	do						2,129.54				2,129.54
Subtotal.....			606.25		636.00		2,240.49		215.45		3,788.19
Grand total.....			1,651.00		1,508.25		7,151.74		451.45		10,762.44

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Department of Agriculture.....	Amount
Total.....	\$10,762.44
	10,762.44

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Daniel J. Flood:											
United States.....	U.S. dollar		234.72		15.79		310.15		15.00		575.65
Jamaica.....	do				21.06		18.00		7.50		46.55
Honduras.....	do				4.28		8.00		31.00		43.28
Guatemala.....	do		138.50		64.24		33.00		68.12		303.85
Nicaragua.....	do		73.75		10.77		19.00		10.24		113.75
Costa Rica.....	do		31.80		47.65		5.00		12.83		97.15
Subtotal.....			478.77		163.69		393.15		144.69		1,180.30
Hon. Melvin R. Laird:											
The Bahamas.....	U.S. dollar		36.00		58.92				8.40		103.32
United States.....	do		25.50		50.69		263.25		23.79		363.23
Subtotal.....			61.50		109.61		263.25		32.19		466.55
Hon. Phil Weaver:											
United States.....	U.S. dollar						1,062.35				1,062.35
Germany.....	do		63.30		138.68		44.60		96.56		343.14
Italy.....	do		66.80		10.99		9.00		10.46		106.25
Spain.....	do		62.03		27.74		13.25		13.62		116.64
France.....	do		18.61		29.75		9.25		63.09		120.70
Subtotal.....			210.74		216.16		1,168.45		183.73		1,779.08
Hon. William E. Minshall:											
United States.....	U.S. dollar		22.75		9.13		1,940.70		14.50		1,987.08
Germany.....	do		22.89		38.78				7.80		69.47
France.....	do		78.95		22.04				20.20		121.19
Egypt.....	do		26.91		13.88		8.00		6.25		55.04
Lebanon.....	do				11.41		8.00		10.75		30.16
Iran.....	do		10.00		7.35				9.57		26.92
Pakistan.....	do		31.66		17.90		28.10		8.50		86.16
India.....	do		35.87		12.60		31.35		5.91		85.73
Thailand.....	do		39.00		24.04		15.00		7.28		85.32
Vietnam.....	do		33.15		41.88		9.00		6.00		90.03
Taiwan.....	do		10.00				35.00		3.50		48.50
Japan.....	do		44.44		34.39		5.00		13.50		97.33
Okinawa.....	do		1.50		.80		84.00		2.00		88.30
Korea.....	do		1.50		.50		86.80		6.50		95.30
Subtotal.....			358.62		234.70		2,250.95		122.26		2,966.53
Samuel R. Preston:											
United States.....	U.S. dollar		25.50		58.83		1,567.77		77.48		1,729.58
The Bahamas.....	do		36.00		58.91				8.40		103.31
Germany.....	do		23.50		52.25		5.00		6.25		87.00
France.....	do		82.00		54.55		8.15		18.00		162.50
Egypt.....	do		23.70		28.75		7.00		9.35		69.80
Lebanon.....	do		15.00		16.50				6.50		38.00
Jordan.....	do		36.00		21.75		24.00		3.50		85.25
Israel.....	do		20.70		7.75		3.00		2.00		33.45
Italy.....	do		40.00		27.40		9.80		17.75		94.95
Spain.....	do		20.50		18.95		4.00		13.50		62.95
Subtotal.....			328.90		346.44		1,628.72		162.73		2,466.79
Grand total.....			1,438.53		1,070.60		5,704.52		645.60		8,859.25

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds:	Amount
Department of the Army.....	\$7,975.88
Department of Navy.....	883.37
Total.....	8,859.25

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations,
U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman (includes 1 trip around the world, and 1 trip to Western Europe):											
France	U.S. dollar		54.00		27.15		4.30		25.10		110.55
Spain	do		104.00		76.60		14.90		57.65		253.15
Switzerland	do		87.00		57.80		8.25		32.65		185.70
Italy	do		54.00		32.75		4.80		29.80		121.35
Lebanon	do		42.00		27.00		5.30		11.40		85.70
Syria	do				14.75		7.25		8.40		30.40
Thailand	do		54.00		40.20		6.95		17.15		118.30
Hong Kong	do		84.00		48.65		10.05		46.50		189.20
Japan	do		54.00		37.50		6.25		29.85		127.60
United States	do		60.00		31.55		7.00		3.50		102.05
Transportation	do						3,170.70				3,170.70
Subtotal			593.00		393.95		3,245.75		262.00		4,494.70
Hon. Hugh Q. Alexander:											
Spain	U.S. dollar		48.00		35.65		4.75		13.40		101.80
Switzerland	do		60.00		34.15		5.40		11.25		110.80
Italy	do		48.00		23.50		4.10		13.50		89.10
Lebanon	do		39.00		26.20		5.25		12.40		82.85
Syria	do				8.50		10.00		5.25		23.75
Thailand	do		48.00		32.65		6.50		12.10		99.25
Hong Kong	do		84.00		45.50		8.25		14.25		152.00
Japan	do		48.00		27.50		6.35		9.95		91.80
United States	do		84.00		29.00		12.25		13.40		138.65
Transportation	do						2,123.30				2,123.30
Subtotal			459.00		262.65		2,186.15		105.50		3,013.30
Hon. Joseph M. Montoya (includes 1 trip around the world, and 1 trip to Western Europe):											
France	U.S. dollar		50.00		26.20		3.90		20.50		100.60
Spain	do		103.00		76.35		10.05		41.95		231.35
Switzerland	do		21.00		19.70		4.10		16.25		61.05
Italy	do		48.00		34.65		8.70		18.05		109.40
Lebanon	do		42.00		29.40		5.75		14.80		91.95
Jordan	do				8.50		4.90		8.75		22.15
Thailand	do		54.00		39.70		6.25		15.60		115.55
Hong Kong	do		84.00		57.80		9.65		18.70		170.15
Japan	do		54.00		36.00		7.10		17.20		114.30
United States	do		86.00		44.35		10.75		19.40		160.50
Transportation	do						3,421.35				3,421.35
Subtotal			542.00		372.65		3,492.50		191.20		4,598.35
Hon. John J. Rhodes:											
France	U.S. dollar		50.00		24.80		4.50		20.85		100.15
Switzerland	do		21.00		17.20		3.20		14.30		55.70
Spain	do		49.00		36.15		4.00		19.70		108.85
Transportation	do						993.50				993.50
Subtotal			120.00		78.15		1,005.20		54.85		1,258.20
Hon. Silvio O. Conte:											
Morocco	U.S. dollars		58.00		64.50		9.50		16.25		148.25
Liberia	do		90.00		56.00		5.50		14.75		166.25
Nigeria	do		84.00		53.00		5.50		8.50		151.00
Congo	do				30.50		7.50		14.25		52.25
South Africa	do		70.50		58.00		10.25		16.50		155.25
Rhodesia	do		28.20		25.50		5.00		6.50		65.20
Kenya	do		46.30		36.00		9.00		11.25		102.55
Ethiopia	do		41.00		57.50		10.25		9.00		117.75
Italy	do		104.00		82.00		24.25		9.50		219.75
Germany	do		56.00		58.00		8.50		10.25		132.75
France	do		42.00		39.50		9.75		9.75		101.00
England	do		48.00		61.00		12.00		7.50		128.50
United States	do		33.25		28.50		14.50		34.00		110.25
Transportation	do						2,129.35				2,129.35
Subtotal			701.25		650.00		2,260.85		168.00		3,780.10
Kenneth Sprinkle:											
France	U.S. dollar		48.00		26.25		2.45		18.20		94.90
Switzerland	do		27.00		21.50		2.70		14.50		65.70
Spain	do		42.00		32.15		3.40		19.20		96.75
Transportation	do						1,010.40				1,010.40
Subtotal			117.00		79.90		1,018.95		51.90		1,267.75
Francis G. Merrill (includes 1 trip around the world, and 1 trip to Western Europe):											
France	U.S. dollar		48.00		25.10		3.25		19.35		95.70
Switzerland	do		81.00		51.00		7.05		33.65		172.70
Spain	do		90.00		79.15		12.75		38.75		220.65
Italy	do		39.00		18.80		5.20		11.75		74.75
Lebanon	do		36.00		23.60		11.95		10.75		82.30
Jordan	do				7.80		8.00		3.50		19.30
Thailand	do		39.00		26.15		4.70		12.05		81.90
Hong Kong	do		72.00		52.10		11.75		14.00		149.85
Japan	do		42.00		23.00		5.50		11.00		81.50
United States	do		50.00		24.30		22.00		16.40		118.70
Transportation	do						3,034.80				3,034.80
Subtotal			503.00		331.00		3,126.95		171.20		4,132.15
Grand total			3,035.25		2,168.30		16,336.35		1,004.65		22,544.55

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: International Cooperation Administration.....

Amount
\$22,544.55

JANUARY 1962.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on General Government Matters, Commerce, and Related Agencies, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Sidney R. Yates: Republic of Panama.....	U.S. dollar.....		57.00		45.40				47.97		150.37
Transportation.....	do.....						¹ 173.24				173.24
Subtotal.....			57.00		45.40		173.24		47.97		323.61
Hon. John F. Shelley: England.....	U.S. dollar.....		95.00		72.98		4.00		8.50		180.48
France.....	do.....		80.50		58.00		4.50		53.22		196.82
Ireland.....	do.....		66.80		42.95		30.00		10.50		150.25
Transportation.....	do.....						970.00				970.00
Subtotal.....			242.30		174.53		1,008.50		72.22		1,497.55
Hon. George E. Shipley: Canal Zone.....	U.S. dollar.....		125.33		44.50						169.83
Transportation.....	do.....						² 313.85				313.85
Subtotal.....			125.33		44.50		313.85				483.68
Earl C. Silsby: Republic of Panama.....	U.S. dollar.....		42.00		16.90				37.15		96.05
Transportation.....	do.....						³ 40.90				40.90
Subtotal.....			42.00		16.90		40.90		37.15		136.95
Grand total.....			466.63		281.33		1,536.49		157.34		2,441.79

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds:
Panama Canal Company.....
Department of Commerce.....Amount
\$944.24
1,497.55
2,441.79

Total.....

¹ Excludes meals and transportation on Government-owned ship valued at \$240.
² Does not include meals and transportation on Government-owned ship valued at \$340.
³ Does not include meals and transportation on Government-owned ship valued at \$140.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General Government Matters,
Commerce and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Michael J. Kirwan: United States.....	U.S. dollar.....		140.68		116.85				107.15		264.68
Territories.....	do.....		3.50		18.50				7.25		29.25
Japan.....	do.....		49.50		42.25				6.00		97.75
Transportation.....	do.....						2,092.70				2,092.70
Subtotal.....			193.68		177.60		2,092.70		120.40		2,584.38
Kenneth Sprankle: United States.....	U.S. dollar.....		147.25		117.50				82.25		347.00
Territories.....	do.....		18.50		19.75				6.00		44.25
Japan.....	do.....		49.50		42.25				6.00		97.75
Transportation.....	do.....						2,077.78				2,077.78
Subtotal.....			215.25		179.50		2,077.78		94.25		2,566.78
Eugene B. Wilhelm: United States.....	U.S. dollar.....		150.15		98.25				98.75		347.15
Territories.....	do.....		18.50		19.50				4.85		42.85
Japan.....	do.....		49.50		42.25				6.00		97.75
Transportation.....	do.....						2,040.31				2,040.31
Subtotal.....			218.15		160.00		2,040.31		109.60		2,528.06
Grand total.....			627.08		517.10		6,210.79		324.25		7,679.22

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Department of the Interior.....

Amount
\$7,679.22
7,679.22

Total.....

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Military Construction, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charles R. Jonas:											
Morocco	U.S. dollar		31.49		8.25				5.50		45.24
Spain	do		57.50		28.19		1.96		14.27		101.92
Italy	do		30.52		24.57		53.37		7.15		115.61
Switzerland	do				7.37		26.14				33.51
Germany	do		12.16		6.77		26.45				45.38
France	do		39.91		18.87		25.09				83.87
Great Britain	do		56.61		25.26		7.91		1.38		91.16
United States	do		20.50		17.64		1,158.04		54.45		1,250.63
Subtotal			248.69		136.92		1,298.96		82.75		1,767.32
Grand total			248.69		136.92		1,298.96		82.75		1,767.32

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Department of Defense..... Amount \$1,767.32
Total..... 1,767.32

HARRY SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney:											
Japan	U.S. dollar		75.00		61.25		6.00		22.50		164.75
Philippines	do		36.00		26.00		3.50		5.80		71.30
Hong Kong	do		55.00		48.25		5.75		18.00		127.00
United States	do		285.00		191.00		16.00		56.50		548.50
Transportation	do						2,656.25				2,656.25
Subtotal			451.00		326.50		2,687.50		102.80		3,567.80
Hon. Frank T. Bow:											
Philippines	U.S. dollar		96.00		40.25				3.50		139.75
Germany	do		70.00		48.00		6.50		13.25		137.75
Turkey	do		45.00		33.75		7.00		11.50		97.25
Greece	do		39.99		26.50		8.75		9.75		84.99
Italy	do		30.45		20.75		6.75		12.75		70.70
United States	do		112.50		30.50		13.00		13.00		169.00
Transportation	do						3,091.00				3,091.00
Subtotal			393.94		199.75		3,133.00		63.75		3,790.44
Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb:											
France	U.S. dollar		68.00		60.00				22.00		150.00
Denmark	do		30.00		20.00				20.00		70.00
Belgium	do		6.00		3.00				2.00		11.00
Germany	do		73.00		45.00		15.00		30.00		163.00
Austria	do		23.00		15.00				25.00		63.00
Italy	do		86.00		40.00		13.00		25.00		164.00
Greece	do		24.00		10.00				10.00		44.00
Lebanon	do		24.00		15.00				10.00		49.00
Syria	do		7.00		8.00				4.00		19.00
Jordan	do				2.00				10.00		12.00
Egypt	do		10.00		10.00				5.00		25.00
Spain	do		48.00		40.00				25.00		113.00
Transportation	do						926.20				926.20
Subtotal			399.00		268.00		954.20		188.00		1,809.20
Hon. E. A. Cederberg:											
France	U.S. dollar		99.30		83.60		20.00		8.00		210.90
Switzerland	do		57.00		51.89		38.24		12.50		159.63
Italy	do		64.72		72.29		30.00		11.00		178.01
Spain	do		88.00		67.00		20.00		9.50		184.50
Mexico	do		169.37		135.66				58.95		363.98
Transportation	do						1,254.39				1,254.39
Subtotal			478.39		410.44		1,362.63		99.95		2,351.41
Jay B. Howe:											
Japan	U.S. dollar		60.00		54.00		11.00		18.50		143.50
Philippines	do		29.50		18.50		2.50		7.60		58.10
Hong Kong	do		65.00		54.25		7.50		19.65		146.40
United States	do		253.50		166.75		38.65		49.50		508.40
Transportation	do						1,996.19				1,996.19
Subtotal			408.00		293.50		2,055.84		95.25		2,852.59
Grand total			2,130.33		1,498.19		10,193.17		549.75		14,371.44

RECAPITULATION

Department of State..... Amount \$14,371.44

JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Judiciary.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Tom Steed:											
United States	U.S. dollar		15.00		11.75		986.40		5.40		1,018.55
England	do		65.00		32.30		4.00		5.60		106.90
Holland	do		15.00		10.50				3.40		28.90
Belgium	do		17.00		15.75		2.00		3.50		38.25
France	do		36.50		40.50		8.00		7.00		92.00
Subtotal			148.50		110.80		1,000.40		24.90		1,284.60
Hon. John R. Pillion:											
United States	U.S. dollar		15.00		11.75		1,021.86		5.40		1,054.01
England	do		66.00		32.30		2.00		5.60		105.90
Holland	do		15.00		10.50				3.50		29.00
Belgium	do		17.00		15.75		2.00		3.50		38.25
France	do		15.50		10.07		4.00		4.50		34.07
Subtotal			128.50		80.37		1,029.86		22.50		1,261.23
A. A. Gunnels:											
United States	U.S. dollar		15.00		11.75		980.41		5.45		1,012.61
England	do		65.00		32.30		4.00		5.60		106.90
Holland	do		15.00		10.50				3.50		29.00
Belgium	do		17.00		15.75		4.00		3.50		40.25
France	do		36.50		40.50		10.00		7.00		94.00
Subtotal			148.50		110.80		998.41		25.05		1,282.76
Grand total			425.50		301.97		3,028.67		72.45		3,828.59

RECAPITULATION

Government Department: Post Office Dept. Amount \$3,828.59

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank J. Becker:											
England	Pound	38-5-6	107.18	34-12-0	96.88	9-5-0	25.90	14-2-6	39.54	96-5-0	269.50
Germany	Deutsche mark	357.48	85.12	656.53	156.32	5,134.84	1,222.59	366.08	87.14	6,514.93	1,551.17
Austria	Schilling	2,731.20	105.05	1,769.00	68.04	807.15	31.04	926.35	35.63	6,233.70	239.76
France	Franc	275	56.12	271	55.31	128	26.12	142	28.98	816	166.53
Total, counterpart funds			353.47		376.55		1,305.65		191.29		2,226.96
John R. Blandford (committee counsel):											
Counterpart funds:											
Australia	Pound	24-18-0	74.66	22-8-0	67.18	25-6-0	76.00	27-8-0	82.16	100-0-0	300.00
Thailand	Baht	156.62	60.24	27.82	10.70			10.56	4.06	195	75.00
Singapore	Dollar	598.78	25.95	237.73	10.30	128.15	5.55	535.35	23.20	1,500	65.00
Hong Kong	do	275.14	52.25	305.64	58.05	163.88	31.10	1,255.34	288.60	2,000	380.00
Taipei	do	642.00	16.05	1,296.00	32.40			62.00	1.55	2,000	50.00
Japan	Yen	2,453.6	69.93	2,747.8	78.32	923.8	26.32	1,874.8	53.43	8,000	228.00
Total, counterpart funds			299.08		256.95		138.97		403.00		1,098.00
Appropriated funds (Air Force), United States	U.S. dollar		135.30		76.61		1,489.93		139.85		1,841.69
Total funds expended by Mr. Blandford			434.38		333.56		1,628.90		542.85		2,939.69
William G. Bray: United States	Dollar						510.07				510.07
Total, appropriated funds (Army)							510.07				510.07
James A. Byrne:											
Counterpart funds:											
England	Pound	9-10-0	26.60	9-6-1	26.05	2-0-0	5.60	3-2-10	8.80	23-18-11	67.05
Ireland	do	5-9-0	15.26	5-2-2	14.30			5-10-11	15.53	16-2-1	45.09
France	Franc	329.99	66.80	201.11	58.93	485.45	98.27	104.58	21.17	1,211.14	245.17
Germany	Deutsche mark			14.70	3.50	83.92	19.98	25.20	6.00	123.82	29.48
Italy	Lire	36,556.25	58.49	38,637.50	61.82	56,037.50	89.66	79,937.50	127.90	211,168.75	337.87
Total, counterpart funds			167.15		164.60		231.51		179.40		724.66
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar						1,082.22		.40		1,082.62
England	do		57.20		29.34		12.70		9.50		108.74
Germany	do		46.00		64.00		32.00		13.80		155.80
Spain	do				59.09		17.00		16.24		92.33
Total, appropriated funds (Army)			103.20		152.43		1,143.92		39.94		1,439.49
Total funds expended by Mr. Byrne			270.35		317.03		1,357.43		219.34		2,164.15

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Charles E. Chamberlain:											
Counterpart funds:											
Italy.....	Lire.....	124,669	201.14	148,900	240.15	43,200	69.68	140,731	226.76	457,400	737.73
Switzerland.....	Swiss franc.....	214.70	49.59	195	45.05	189	43.66	111.30	25.71	710	164.01
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	367.35	91.84	330	82.50	266	66.50	71.65	17.91	1,035	258.75
England.....	Pound.....	42-8-9	118.82	46-9-3	130.10			11-2-0	31.08	100-0-0	280.00
France.....	Franc.....	925	187.24	776	157.07			296	60.53	2,000	404.84
Total, counterpart funds.....			648.63		654.87		179.84		361.99		1,845.33
Appropriated funds:											
United States.....	Dollar.....				1.00						1.00
France.....	do.....		38.58		8.75		3.00		13.40		63.73
Germany.....	do.....		5.00		10.30				1.30		16.60
Total, appropriated funds (Army).....			43.58		20.05		3.00		14.70		81.33
Total, funds expended by Mr. Chamberlain.....			692.21		674.92		182.84		376.69		1,926.66
Jeffery Cohelan:											
Counterpart funds:											
Taiwan.....	New Taiwan dollar.....	800	39.22	543	26.61	100	4.90	1,946.30	95.41	3,389.30	166.14
Hong Kong.....	Hong Kong dollar.....	280	51.76	432.87	80.00	62	11.46	827.50	152.97	1,602.37	296.19
Japan.....	Yen.....	5,060	14.11	3,160	8.81	660	1.84	21,120	58.91	30,000	83.67
Total, counterpart funds.....			105.09		115.42		18.20		307.29		546.00
Appropriated funds:											
United States.....	Dollar.....						1,571.35				1,571.35
Alaska.....	do.....		9.00		56.57				.46		66.03
Hawaii.....	do.....		74.52		53.59		2.50				130.61
Japan.....	do.....		19.02		23.29		1.87		1.54		45.72
Korea.....	do.....		6.00		7.75						13.75
Okinawa.....	do.....		3.00		2.20						5.20
Total, appropriated funds (Army).....			111.54		143.40		1,575.72		2.00		1,832.66
Total, funds expended by Mr. Cohelan.....			216.63		258.82		1,593.92		309.29		2,378.66
Clyde Doyle: United States:											
Total, appropriated funds Navy.....		Dollar.....	68.10		103.25		603.00		68.85		843.20
			68.10		103.25		603.00		68.85		843.20
Porter Hardy, Jr.:											
England.....	Pound.....	20-0-0	56.00	11-0-0	30.80	24-0-0	67.20			55-0-0	154.00
Denmark.....	Kroner.....	417.45	60.50	140.55	20.36	145	21.01			708	101.87
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	266	63.30	157	37.38	138	32.86	224	53.33	785	186.87
Austria.....	Schilling.....	4,190.50	161.17	880	33.85	1,040	40.00			6,110.50	235.02
Italy.....	Lire.....	147,658	237.77	53,300	85.83	61,400	98.87	24,870	40.04	287,228	462.51
Greece.....	Drachma.....	589	19.63	393	13.10	100	3.33	830	27.67	1,912	63.73
Egypt.....	Pound.....	12,075	27.17	3,250	7.31	4,275	9.62			19,600	44.10
Lebanon.....	do.....	60-0-0	18.86	38-0-0	11.95	16-0-0	5.03			114-0-0	35.84
Jordan.....	Dinar.....					11.5	32.20			11.5	32.20
Israel.....	Pound.....	48.47	22.43	39.53	13.21	29.00	13.42			117.00	49.06
France.....	Franc.....	785.25	160.26	429.30	87.61	303	61.84	204.95	41.83	1,722.50	351.54
Total, counterpart funds.....			827.09		341.40		385.38		162.87		1,716.74
Philip W. Kelleher (committee counsel):											
Counterpart funds:											
Norway.....	Kroner.....			200	28.00	100	14.00	35	4.90	335	46.90
Denmark.....	do.....			150	21.00	80	11.20			230	32.20
Italy.....	Lire.....	32,000	51.20	30,000	48.00	60,000	96.00	7,000	11.20	129,000	206.40
England.....	Pound.....	10-0-0	28.10	11-0-0	30.91	12-0-0	33.72	7-0-0	19.67	40-0-0	112.40
France.....	Franc.....	600	121.80	300	60.90	100	20.30	15	3.05	1,015	206.05
Netherlands.....	Guilder.....	50	13.80	40	11.20			10	2.80	100	27.80
Total, counterpart funds.....			214.90		200.01		175.22		41.62		631.75
Appropriated funds:											
Norway.....	Dollar.....		45.60		18.15		66.25		12.27		142.27
Denmark.....	do.....		36.48		14.52		57.96		11.08		120.04
Italy.....	do.....		155.04		61.71		289.82		55.42		561.99
England.....	do.....		54.72		21.78		82.81		15.84		175.15
France.....	do.....		136.80		54.45		273.26		52.66		517.17
Netherlands.....	do.....		27.35		10.89		57.97		11.08		107.29
Total, appropriated funds (Air Force).....			455.99		181.50		828.07		158.35		1,623.91
Total, funds expended by Mr. Kelleher.....			670.89		381.51		1,003.29		199.97		2,255.66
Durward G. Hall:											
Counterpart funds:											
United States.....	Dollar.....				1.00						1.00
Italy.....	do.....		48.00		29.70		14.16		21.82		113.68
France.....	do.....		32.39		23.61		3.60		12.14		71.14
Germany.....	do.....		38.31		26.00		10.00		.30		74.61
Total, appropriated funds (Army).....			118.70		80.31		27.16		34.26		260.43

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank Kowalski:											
Counterpart funds:											
France	Franc	576.80	117.95	53.00	10.84	10.00	2.04	9.20	1.88	649.00	132.71
Norway	Kroner	78.20	10.95	5.00	.70			5.00	.70	88.20	12.35
Total, counterpart funds			128.90		11.54		2.04		2.58		145.06
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar				3.50		186.00				189.50
England	do.		19.80		3.35				.70		23.85
Germany	do.		37.45		19.80		2.75		14.60		74.60
Total, appropriated funds (Army)			57.25		26.65		188.75		15.30		287.95
Total, funds expended by Mr. Kowalski			186.15		38.19		190.79		17.88		433.01
Richard E. Lankford:											
Counterpart funds:											
Japan	Yen	15,105.60	41.96	5,000	13.89	1,100	3.06	18,943.40	52.61	40,149.00	11.52
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar	600	15.00	700	17.50	300	7.50	1,000	25.00	2,600	65.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	357.61	62.74	645.32	113.21	229.07	40.19	1,688	292.63	2,900	508.77
Vietnam	Piaster	4,107.67	56.44	2,785.00	38.27			2,108	28.97	9,000	123.68
Thailand	Baht	511.87	24.55	1,450.98	69.59	469.13	22.50	2,174.27	104.28	4,606.25	220.92
Pakistan	Rupee	88.74	18.80	248.27	52.60	446.04	94.50	412.95	87.49	1,196.00	253.39
Italy	Lire	57,504	92.60	53,430	86.04	50,116	80.70	199,589	321.40	360,636	580.74
Austria	Shilling	1,335.00	51.91	3,312.50	128.79	1,150.00	44.71	4,202.50	163.39	10,000	388.80
Great Britain	Pound	13-10-11	37.93	67-15-0	189.70	25-0-0	70.00	93-14-1	262.37	200-0-0	560.00
Total, counterpart funds			401.93		709.59		363.16		1,338.14		2,812.82
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar		108.00		64.15		2,011.34		4.31		2,187.80
Japan	do.		1.00		42.37		10.70		3.69		57.76
Korea	do.		13.00		11.85				2.60		27.45
Taiwan	do.		29.41		9.91				2.00		41.32
Hong Kong	do.		63.04		53.90		5.00		5.41		127.35
Vietnam	do.		13.03		23.27				2.00		38.30
Thailand	do.		36.08		28.48				2.60		67.16
Pakistan	do.		62.50		15.46		5.00		2.53		85.49
Italy	do.		50.00		74.46		7.00		3.95		135.41
Austria	do.		21.26		23.47		14.85		2.79		62.37
Germany	do.		25.71		20.67				3.60		49.98
France	do.		17.53		10.71				1.86		36.10
Great Britain	do.		160.26		53.98		11.20		2.53		227.97
Scotland	do.		62.96		10.00		51.52		1.19		125.67
Total, appropriated funds (Army)			663.78		442.68		2,122.61		41.06		3,270.13
Total, funds expended by Mr. Lankford			1,065.71		1,152.27		2,485.77		1,379.20		6,082.95
Walter Norblad:											
Counterpart funds:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	384	97.50	378	94.50	39	9.75	101	25.25	908	227.00
Italy	Lira	84,375	135.00	79,375	127.00	17,500	28.00	18,750	30.00	194,000	320.00
Greece	Drachma	1,190	39.75	910	30.25	180	6.00	195	6.50	2,475	82.50
Egypt	Pound	40	90.25	38	84.75	6.2	13.75	8.8	19.00	93	207.75
Turkey	Lira	750	83.50	635	70.75	95	10.50	126	14.00	1,606	178.75
Iran	Rial	180	24.00	131	17.50	37	4.75	27	3.75	375	50.00
India	Rupee	320	64.00	264	52.80	53	10.60	93	18.60	730	146.00
Thailand	Baht	2,924	139.25	2,600	119.80	189	9.00	520	24.75	6,233	292.80
Vietnam	Piaster	4,310	59.00	3,630	49.75	340	4.50	750	10.25	8,980	123.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	552	96.80	504	88.25	90	15.80	172	30.00	1,318	230.85
Japan	Yen	11,340	44.50	19,350	40.75	2,880	8.00	2,210	6.30	35,780	99.55
Total, counterpart funds			873.55		776.10		120.65		188.40		1,958.70
Appropriated funds:											
Spain	Dollar		26.05		13.56				8.48		48.09
Germany	do.		21.67		53.16		11.70		22.60		109.13
France	do.		62.13		56.60		6.70		23.16		148.59
Iceland	do.		1.75		3.00						4.75
Total, appropriated funds (Army)			111.60		126.32		18.40		54.24		310.56
Total, funds expended by Mr. Norblad			985.15		902.42		139.05		242.64		2,269.26
Frank C. Osmer:											
Counterpart funds:											
United States	Dollar						1,275.53		6.00		1,281.53
England	do.		12.88		26.22		2.24		13.65		54.99
France	do.		70.00		63.02		36.38		105.24		274.64
Germany	do.		12.40		18.06		34.97		266.68		332.11
Italy	do.		77.26		96.09		35.60		249.87		458.82
Israel	do.		28.52		2.97		2.31		2.78		36.58
Spain	do.		19.51		17.34		2.01		238.47		277.33
Morocco	do.				1.61						1.61
Total, appropriated funds (Army)			220.57		225.31		1,389.04		882.69		2,717.61

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Otis G. Pike:											
Appropriated funds (Navy), Puerto Rico.	Dollar		400.00		214.00		156.00		20.00		790.00
Appropriated funds (Army):											
Spain	do		28.78		42.36		3.25		11.21		85.60
Switzerland	do		18.28		4.32				7.61		11.93
Germany	do		50.21		50.80		12.00		30.04		111.12
France	do		1.75		41.04		6.70		12.60		110.55
Iceland	do				3.00						4.75
Total, appropriated funds (Army).			99.02		141.52		21.95		61.46		323.95
Total, funds expended by Mr. Pike.			499.02		355.52		177.95		81.46		1,113.95
L. Mendel Rivers:											
Counterpart funds:											
Italy	Lire	56,250	90.00	75,000	120.00	9,375	15.00	46,875	75.00	187,500	300.00
Spain	Peseta	10,200	170.00	13,600	226.67	1,700	28.33	8,500	141.67	34,000	566.67
France	Franc	422	84.40	562	112.40	70	14.00	351	70.20	1,465	281.40
Germany	Deutsche mark	750	187.50	850	212.50	50	12.50	550	137.50	2,200	550.00
Total, counterpart funds.			531.90		671.57		69.83		424.37		1,697.67
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar								3.00		3.00
Italy	do		24.00		29.60		14.16		20.32		88.08
France	do		92.91		74.34		6.70		26.45		200.40
Germany	do		69.93		86.26		20.75		50.00		226.94
Spain	do		68.47		86.42		9.09		14.91		178.89
Switzerland	do				5.27				7.20		12.47
Iceland	do		1.75		3.00						4.75
Total, appropriated funds (Army).			257.06		284.89		50.70		121.88		714.53
Total, funds expended by Mr. Rivers.			788.96		956.46		120.53		546.25		2,412.20
Samuel S. Stratton:											
Counterpart funds:											
England	Pound	4-0-0	11.20	5-0-0	14.00	1-0-0	2.80			10-0-0	28.00
France	Franc	49.60	10.13	40.00	8.16	25.00	5.10			114.60	23.39
Germany	Deutsche mark	103.90	25.97	35.00	8.75	11.00	2.75			149.90	37.47
Total, counterpart funds.			47.30		30.91		10.65				88.86
Appropriated funds:											
England	Dollar								.85		.85
France	do				6.35				1.50		7.85
Germany	do		4.45		15.05		1.00		11.30		31.80
Total, appropriated funds (Air Force).			4.45		21.40		1.00		13.65		40.50
Total, funds expended by Mr. Stratton.			51.75		52.31		11.65		13.65		129.36
Victor Wickersham:											
Counterpart funds:											
France	Franc	1,500	306.15	600	122.46			400	81.64	2,500	510.25
Germany	Deutsche mark	428	108.36	300	75.95	5,771.40	1,442.85	272	68.86	6,771.40	1,696.02
Switzerland	Swiss franc	596	140.24	200	47.06			204	48.23	1,000	235.53
Greece	Drachma	660	22.00	1,050	35.00			800	29.67	2,600	86.67
Turkey	Lira	495	55.00	270	30.00			135	15.00	900	100.00
Italy	Lire	70,000	113.27	50,000	80.91	161,968	260.82	37,500	61.68	319,468	516.68
Spain	Peseta	3,000	50.25	2,500	42.33			1,000	16.75	6,500	109.33
United Kingdom	Pound	54-0-0	151.20	20-0-0	56.00			7-0-0	19.60	81-0-0	226.80
Total, counterpart funds.			946.47		489.71		1,703.67		341.43		3,481.28
Appropriated funds:											
France	Dollar				3.53				5.47		9.00
Germany	do		193.00		29.32				1.68		224.00
Switzerland	do		17.93		7.72				1.35		27.00
Turkey	do		18.10		8.00				1.90		28.00
Italy	do				13.62				6.28		19.90
United Kingdom	do				14.08				1.92		16.00
Total, appropriated funds (Air Force).			229.03		76.27				18.60		323.90
Total, funds expended by Mr. Wickersham.			1,175.50		565.98		1,703.67		360.03		3,805.18
Total			8,624.63		7,115.81		14,816.09				36,185.74

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds:	\$18,973.83
Department of the Army	11,748.71
Department of the Navy	1,633.20
Department of the Air Force	3,590.00
Total	36,185.74

MAR. 2, 1962.

CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Rules, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
H. Allen Smith:											
Denmark.....	Kroner.....	200	29.23	165	24.00	173	25.00	62	8.98	600	87.21
Switzerland.....	Francs.....	358	83.50	862	200.78	160	36.25	120	27.50	1,500	348.03
Italy.....	Lire.....	42,265	67.96	122,735	197.50	20,000	32.40	16,000	24.20	200,000	322.06
Do.....	do.....					62,049	99.92			62,049	99.92
Total.....			180.69		422.28		193.57		60.68		857.22

NOTE.—Additional report will be filed when additional information received from Department of State.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S.-dollar equivalent)..... Amount \$857.22

FEB. 26, 1962.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harris B. McDowell:											
United Kingdom.....	Pound.....	53-0-0	148.40	68-0-0	190.40	22-8-0	62.72	36-10-0	102.20	179-18-0	503.72
Germany ¹	Deutsche mark.....					3,711.16	934.80			3,711.16	934.80
Total.....			148.40		190.40		997.52		102.20		1,438.52
Adin M. Downer:											
United Kingdom.....	Pound.....	25-0-0	70.00	76-8-9	214.49	10-14-7	30.87	22-13-9	62.18	134-16-11	377.54
Germany ¹	Deutsche mark.....					3,711.16	934.80			3,711.16	934.80
Total.....			70.00		214.49		965.67		62.18		1,312.34
Horace R. Kornegay:											
United Kingdom.....	Pound.....	23-17-3	67.18	36-0-0	100.80	5-0-0	14.00	6-1-8	16.50	70-18-11	198.48
Germany ¹	Deutsche mark.....					3,711.16	934.80			3,711.16	934.80
Total.....			67.18		100.80		948.80		16.50		1,133.28
Jean Johnson:											
United Kingdom.....	Pound.....	25-19-6	72.72	43-15-8	122.58	3-0-0	8.40	6-5-0	17.50	79-0-0	221.20
Germany ¹	Deutsche mark.....					3,711.16	934.80			3,711.16	934.80
Total.....			72.72		122.58		943.20		17.50		1,156.00
W.O. Cooper: France.....	New franc.....	470.40	96.00	1,852.20	378.00	1,274.00	260.00	2,403.40	490.48	6,000.00	1,224.48
Total.....			464.30		1,006.27		4,115.19		688.86		6,264.62

¹ Currency expended for purchase of transportation only.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount \$6,264.62

FEB. 15, 1962.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1788. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain oil and gas lessees under the Mineral Leasing Act"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1789. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 13th annual report of the U.S. Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program, pursuant to section 350(e) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CVIII—239

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 558. Resolution for consideration of S. 167, an act to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the anti-trust laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 559. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10079, a bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10606. A bill to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10607. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for additional depreciation deductions and to eliminate certain inequities in the valuation of inventories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 10609. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10610. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 10611. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 10612. A bill to amend the provisions of section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which require the filing of certain statements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 10613. A bill to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 10614. A bill to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the trained speech and hearing specialists (variously called speech pathologists, audiologists, speech and hearing clinicians, speech correctionists, etc.) needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10615. A bill to extend and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10616. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10617. A bill providing that the U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10618. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 10619. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest

Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10620. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 213 of the International Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10621. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10622. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding thereto a new section imposing a tax in respect of tips and gratuities whenever election is made to have them included in the basis for benefits under the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10624. A bill to provide that until the national debt is retired, not less than 10 percent of the net budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year shall be utilized solely for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McVEY:

H.R. 10625. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 10626. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 10627. A bill to provide for two naval homes for treatment in the field of geriatrics, one to be located on the east coast and one on the west coast; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 10628. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 10629. A bill to establish a Communications Satellite Authority to provide for the development of a global communication system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 10630. A bill to provide for the application of power revenues from reclamation projects to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAM:

H.R. 10631. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Dimakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10632. A bill for the relief of Vlasios G. Dimakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 10633. A bill for the relief of Mul Chuck Hoo, also known as Chang Pon Lon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10634. A bill for the relief of Mul Kwok Kwong, also known as Fong Yat Chot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10635. A bill for the relief of Mul Yin Lam, also known as Ching Ken Yin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10636. A bill for the relief of Elio Vecchiarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 10637. A bill for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 10638. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Aboud and her children, Samuel, Eliahou, and Rahamin Aboud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10639. A bill for the relief of Estela Castro Dionisio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10640. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of Lourdes Memorial Hospital, Binghamton, N.Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 10641. A bill for the relief of Chan Wing Cheung (also known as Bill Woo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 10642. A bill for the relief of Tze Yao Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10643. A bill for the relief of Gail Hohlweg Atabay and her daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 10644. A bill for the relief of Alexander Kleinlerer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

247. Mr. McDOWELL presented a petition of the mayor and council of Wilmington, Del., endorsing approval of the President's request for an appropriation for the operation of the Peace Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 the House of Representatives passed H.R. 132, a bill designed to set up a program of Federal matching grants

for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

Although commitments in Maine prompted me to be absent when a vote was taken on this legislation, I would like to state for the record that were I present, I would have voted in favor of this bill.

During the last session of Congress, I introduced legislation—H.R. 2910—which had the same intent as H.R. 132, my bill differing from H.R. 132 only in the means by which the desired end was to be attained.

The instant legislation makes provision for \$25 million in Federal grants, with no State to receive more than \$1 million and each State matching the Federal extension on a 50-50 basis. My bill provided \$1 million for each of the States and was minus any provision for State matching.

The Senate last year passed legislation providing assistance to the States in the construction of television facilities, this legislation differing in some respects from the bill recently passed by the House. I feel confident that, in due